

DEFENSE
OF THE
Christian Sabbath.

PART the FIRST.

In Answer to
A TREATISE of Mr. *Thomas Bampfield*
Pleading for
SATURDAY-SABBATH.

The Second Edition.

BY
John Wallis
JOHN WALLIS, D.D. And Professor of Geometry
in the University of OXFORD.

Imprimatur,

HEN. ALDRICH,
Vice-Can. Oxon.

Feb. 17. 2.
1693. 5

OXFORD,
Printed by *L. Lichfield*, And are to be Sold by *Thomas Bennet*,
at the *Half-Moon* in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*, London. 1693.

S.D.A. Theological Seminary

Takoma Park
Washington 12, D.C.

102426

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE first Edition of this Discourse 1691 being all Dispersed, and scarce to be had since which time Mr. *Bampffield* hath published a Reply, to which there is a Rejoinder now in the Press: It is thought advisable to reprint this (with very little alteration) page for page as before, so as not to disorder the Citations.

Vault
BV
125
W35
1693
Her

3547460

DISCOURSE

Concerning The Christian Sabbath.

STR, June 12. 1692.

I Had a while since a Book sent me by the Carrier (I know not well from whom) of Mr. *Thomas Bampffield*, which in the Title-Page, is said to be Printed for the Author — 1692. It is Concerning the *Sabbath*. Which he thinks should rather be Observed on what we call *Saturday*, than on what we call *Sunday*.

I should not, on this Account, give any Disturbance to the Peace or Practice of the Church where I live, so that a Sabbath be duly Observed as to the *Substantials* of it, though perhaps not upon what day I should chuse.

For I do not know, and I believe no man living can tell me, whether what we now call *Sunday*, be a *First*, a *Second*, a *Third*, or a *Seventh* day, in a continued Circulation of *Weeks* from the *Creation*. And what it is impossible for me to know, I think will be no Crime to be Ignorant of. Nor hath this Author any other way than common *Tradition*, (on which he is not willing that we should lay weight,) whereby to guess, which is the *First*, or which is the *Seventh* day, in such a Circulation of *Weeks*, either from the *Creation*, or even from *Christ's Time*.

I am sufficiently satisfied that we ought to keep a *Sabbath*, that is, a day of *Holy Rest*, after *Six days of ordinary Labour*, according to the *Fourth Commandment*: and this in a continued Course or Circulation: But I am not certain, nor can I be, which

A

is

is a First, or a Seventh day in such a Circulation of Weeks from the Creation. And therefore shall content my self to observe that day which I find observed in the Church where I live. In *Old England* I observe the Sabbath which here I find; And if I were in *New-England*, I would observe the Sabbath which I find observed there. Though I think it may be disputable whether they and we may be said to observe the same day, (the First Meridian passing between them and us.) And yet I would not advise to have it changed in either.

Now I can hardly think, that God hath laid the great stresse of so weighty a Point (as whereon the main of Gods publick Worship doth much depend) on such a Circumstance as is impossible for us to know, and of which we may be modestly ignorant.

I should rather think that what Christ says of the Place, *Joh. 4. 21, 23. The hour cometh when ye shall neither in this Mountain nor in Jerusalem worship the Father, but the true worshipers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in Truth*, is in good measure true of the Time also; And, as it is not so material whether in this or that Place, God be Worshiped, so he be *Worshiped Aright*: so neither is it so material, whether on this or that day; as, that a Sabbath or day of *Holy Rest* be duly kept. The publick Worship of God, was then in great measure confined to the Temple; not indifferently, in any place within thy Gates, but in the place which the Lord thy God shall chuse, to put his name there, *Deut. 16. 6, 11, 15, 16.* For which any other place may now be as well assigned; that men pray every where lifting up holy hands, &c. *1 Tim. 2. 8.* (Privately in private places, and Publickly in places appointed for the publick.) And I do not think we are now more confined to the Jewish Sabbath, than to the Jewish Temple.

This premised, I can agree with this Author in many things by him discussed.

I agree, that *Our Lord Jesus Christ* (according to his Divinity) was God (and is so) the true God, the God that made Heaven and Earth, the God who delivered the Law upon Mount Sinai. For though we do acknowledge, in the Godhead, a Trinity of Persons; Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, (whereof Christ according to his Divinity is called the Second Person, the Son of God, or God the Son,) yet those Three Persons are but One God. Nor do I know any other true God but One, The God that made Heaven and Earth, The Lord Jehovah, The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, The Lord God of Israel. The Lord their God who brought them out of the Land of Egypt, out of the House of Bondage, and besides whom we are to have

no

no Other God, The God who delivered the Law to them on Mount Sinai; And I do agree that *Our Lord Jesus Christ*, is (as to his Divinity) this God, the True God, the only true God, and that he was so before his Incarnation. How far each of those Actions are to be ascribed to this or that Person of the Trinity, we need not be over solicitous. What in the New Testament is more peculiarly ascribed to this or that of the Three Persons, is in the Old Testament wont to be ascribed to God indefinitely, without such particular application; the doctrine of the Trinity being then not so distinctly discovered. But I cannot agree that Christ as God and Man (in contradistinction to the Father and Holy Ghost) did all those things, for he was not then Man.

I agree with him also, that God who made the World in Six days, Rested the Seventh day, *Gen. 2. 2, 3. Exod. 20. 11.* And that he Blessed the Sabbath day and Hallowed it. And that accordingly he hath appointed after Six days of ordinary Labour, Man should observe a Seventh day of Holy Rest, and this in a continued succession.

But I should rather say, that *our Lord Jesus Christ* is (according to his Divinity) that God who Blessed the Seventh day *Gen. 2.* than, that the God who Blessed the Sabbath day, is the Lord Jesus Christ; (as he doth *p. 64.* and elsewhere very often, seeming to lay great stresse upon it.) For he was not then the Lord Christ (God and Man) nor did he bless it as Christ, but as God; in Union with the Father and Holy Ghost, not as contradistinguished from them.

I agree also, that the Law of the Sabbath is one of the Decalogue or Ten Commandments delivered to Israel on Mount Sinai. *Ex. 20.*

But I am willing to think it was a Law before. Not only because we find it observed, *Exod. 16.* (before the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai, *Ex. 20.*) but especially because of that in *Gen. 2. 3. God blessed the Seventh day and Sanctified it, because in it he rested from all his Work.* And those who are most averse to the Morality (as it is wont to be called) or the Perpetuity of the Sabbath, or Day of Holy Rest, and are yet very zealous for the Holiness of Places, would be very fond of it if they could find so clear a Testimony, and so ancient, for the holiness of Place, as here is for that of Time.

I agree also that the Law of the Decalogue or Ten Commandments, though then given peculiarly to Israel, is Obligatory to Us also. For though some Clauses therein do peculiarly respect them; as that *who brought thee out of the land of Egypt out of the house*

A 2

house

house of bondage, and that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, (which I think is there said with a particular respect to the land of Canaan, which God gave to Israel, not to us;) yet the Body of that Law and the preceptive part of it, I take to be Obligatory to others also, and to Us in particular; the Decalogue being *Declarative* of what was (I think) a *Law before* (however neglected or forgotten,) and is by Christ and his Apostles frequently cited as such, even to Gentiles as well as Jews.

Nor will I dispute it with him, whether the *Sabbath* were observed from the Creation to the Flood. For I am willing to think that if it were not, it should have been; though, in the short History that *Moses* gives us of that time, there be no mention made of such observation. But I doubt it was not *universally* so observed, if at all. For when *all flesh had corrupted their ways*, I doubt the Sabbath day and the Worship of that day were by them not much regarded. Nor do I find (*Gen. 2. 3.*) any *express Command* (such as he demands for the *First days Sabbath*) that it should be observed thenceforth by Men, *every Seventh day* of the Week for ever. How far the words *he blessed and sanctified it* may extend I will not dispute. It may be a *strong Intimation* (and I think it is,) But it is not expressly said, that, *All Mankind must, for ever after, observe every Seventh day, in every Week, of days, reckoned continually from the first Creation.* Nor do I think it necessary to have been so recorded by *Moses*, (any more, than the Law for *Sacrifices*,) if it did otherwise appear to have been the Will of God. And therefore I would not have him lay too great a stress, on what he saith, that *there is no express Commandment Recorded in the New Testament, for observing the First day*: It is enough if we there find sufficient Intimation for us to judge that God was pleased to have it observed.

I say the like as to the time from the Flood to that of *Abraham*, and from thence to the coming of *Israel* out of *Egypt*. For I do not find any mention of their observing a Sabbath (either in the Writings of *Moses*, or the Book of *Job*) earlier than that of *Exod. 16.* after *Israel's* coming out of *Egypt*, and after the time that God is said to have *made a statute and ordinance for them at Marah, Ex. 15. 25.* What that Statute and Ordinance was, we cannot tell. The Jewish Writers think (or some of them) that it was that of the *Sabbath*; and perhaps it might, or this be some part of it. It was perhaps a Revival of what had been before dis-used. Nor is it likely that their Task-Masters in *Egypt* would

would suffer them to be Idle, and neglect their Work, one whole day in Seven.

Nor do I find any foot-steps in History that any other Nation but the Jews did (for many Ages after this time) so much as measure out their time by Weeks.

I know that many Learned and Pious men have been searching to that purpose and willing to lay hold on any thing that might seem to look that way. And I should be well enough pleased to see it made out. But I have not seen any thing convictive to give me satisfaction therein.

I have consulted *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and what he cites in the Fifth Book of his *Stromata*, who hath I believe made the best search of any into Heathen Writers for that purpose. His design in that Book is to shew that the Heathens had stolen or borrowed much of their *Philosophy* from what he calls *Philosophia Barbara* or *Barbarorum*, meaning thereby the *Jewish Learning*; (for, with the *Greeks*, all but themselves were *Barbarians*.) And amongst many other things, he takes notice of the number *Seven* sometimes mentioned in Heathen Writers, as with some veneration; which he thinks to be occasioned from that number oft mentioned in the Sacred Writers, and particularly from that of their *Sabbath*, and measuring their time by *Weeks*. But he doth not at all intimate as if himself did think the *Heathens* so to have divided their time, or to keep that Sabbath, but only that they were acquainted with the Jewish Learning, and borrowed much of theirs from thence.

That which therein seemed to me the most promising (and by others also is oft alledged) was that cited from *Hesiod*, *ἡ ἑβδόμη ἡμέρα* (*the Seventh a Sacred day.*) But when I consulted the place in *Hesiod*, in his *ἑρμῆς καὶ ἡμῆρας*, (in the latter part of which he treats of *Days*) I find nothing there of *Weeks*, or *days of the Week*, but only *days of the Month*. For 'tis this he there propo-
seth to speak of, *τεσσαρὲς μῆνες*, (*the Thirty days of the Month*), on which he makes divers Remarks; as, which of them were to be accounted *Good days*, and which *Bad days*, and, for *what purposes*. And begins with these,

Πρῶτη, ἔτη, πρῶτε π, καὶ ἑβδόμη, ἡμέρα ἡμέρας,
τῇ δ' Ἀπολλῶνα χρυσόεντα χίλυντο Δαμό.

(Begin we with the First, and the Fourth, and the Seventh, the Sacred day, Because that on this day Apollo who hath the Golden Sword

Sword was born of Latona.) So that (it seems) the *Seventh* day (not the *First*) was then *Sunday*. (For *Apollo* with his *Gold Sword*, is but another name for the *Sun*.) But it was the *Seventh* day of the *Month*, not the *Seventh* day of the *Week*, (for of *Weeks* he there says nothing.) And he then goes on to speak of the *Eighth* and *Ninth* days; then of the *Eleventh* and *Twelfth*, next of the *Thirteenth*, and so of other days of the *Month*; shewing which of them were accounted *Lucky* days, and which *Unlucky*, and for what *Affairs*. But nothing of *Weeks* at all.

However, *Hesiod* himself, though one of the Oldest of the *Heathen* Writers, is but young as to the times we speak of; who is reckoned to have lived about the time of King *Uzziah*, Seven Hundred years after the time we are now considering, upon the coming of *Israel* out of *Egypt*. Nor doth *Clemens Alexandrinus* think, when they name *Seven*, it was from any *Old Tradition* (from *Adam* or *Noah*) but from what acquaintance they then had with the *Jewish* Writers of later time.

Nor do I find any thing that is more to the purpose, in all there cited by *Clemens Alexandrinus* than this of *Hesiod*. But if any where he could have found, that the *Heathens* divided their Time by *Weeks*; no doubt but he would have mentioned this as borrowed from the *Jewish Learning*; (which was the thing he was there inquiring after.) And, when he saith nothing of it, we may be sure he could not find it. I find indeed that some of the *Heathens* (as *Perfius* and *Lucian*) do laugh or jeer at the *Jewish Sabbath* (*recutitaque Sabbata pallent*) and therefore did know of the *Jewish Sabbath*; But not that they did observe it, or so much as divide their Time by *Weeks*.

Now if we should admit, that in some Families (where the true Worship of God was preserved) there be a strong presumption (for 'tis no more) that they did observe a *Sabbath*; that is, a *Seventh* day of *Holy Rest* after *Six* days of ordinary Labour; yet 'tis a question, whether that were just the *Seventh* day in a continual succession of *Weeks* from the Creation.

And if at any time there chance to be an intermission, and the day forgotten, it is impossible (without a Miracle or a new Revelation) that it can be restored again. And if from thenceforth they would again keep a *Sabbath* (as we find the Pass-over was revived by *Hezekiah* and *Josiah* which had been long intermitted 2 *Kings* 23. and 2 *Chr.* 25.) they must begin at adventure, and thence continue it.

Now if we consider, that the true Worship of God was oft reduced

duced to some one family, as in the time of *Noah*, and perhaps of *Abraham*; and even that Family sometimes corrupt enough, (as was that of *Nabor*, from whence *Abraham* for that reason was removed; and that of *Laban* where *Jacob* sojourned; and how oft also the like happened, we cannot tell.) It was very possible the *Sabbath* might be neglected; as himself observes p. 63, it had been before and under the Captivity for a long time; and made a *Market-day*, as well as any other day of the *Week*; like as the *Temple* was become a *Market-place*, *Mat.* 21. 12, 13. *Joh.* 2. 14. 16. As was also the Pass-over in great measure from the time of *Samuel* till that of *Josiah*, 2 *Chr.* 35. 18. And the Feast of *Tabernacles*, from the days of *Josiah* to *Nehemiah*, *Neh.* 8. 17. And *Circumcision*, for Forty years together in the Wilderness, *Josh.* 5. 5.

Now if *Circumcision* and the Pass-over and the Feast of *Tabernacles* were thus neglected when they were at Liberty; how much more the *Sabbath*, when they were *Band-men* in *Egypt*; of which we have not the least mention from God's keeping a *Sabbath*, *Gen.* 2. 3. till after *Israel's* coming out of *Egypt*, *Exod.* 16.

Nor is there the least mention (as I shew'd but now) in any History Sacred or Profane, so much as of dividing their time by *Weeks*, all that time; nor, except that of *Israel*, for many Ages after.

And though the *Sun*, *Moon* and *Stars* (*Gen.* 1. 14.) are said to be for Signs and for Seasons, for Days and for Years, yet not a word is there of *Weeks*. Nor could they indeed, by their Motions, distinguish *Weeks*, as they do *Months* and *Years*. And therefore though I find *Years* and *Months* to have been observed all the World over long ago; yet *Weeks* no where (that I know) of ancient times, but by the Nation of the *Jews* only, nor by them before their coming out of *Egypt*.

So that, though, I am willing to think, the *Sabbath* ought to have been observed all that while, yet there is too much reason to doubt it was not; or, if at all, not without frequent intermissions, which would, in this case, be fatal.

Now to argue as he doth, that *Abel*, and *Enoch*, and *Noah*, and *Abraham*, were good men, and are (some of them) said to walk with God, and to keep his Commandments, and therefore may be presumed to have kept a *Sabbath*, is but a weak argument as to matter of Fact; and, to beg the Question. For we are not to think them so good as to be guilty of no failings or omissions.

The Law of Marriage is certainly as Old, if not Older than that of the *Sabbath*, the tenour of which was (he tells us p. 62.) that they Two should be one flesh; not, they Three, Four or Five: yet he

he tells us also, that *Poligamy*, or *having many Wives*, was frequently practised, from *Lamech* to *Malachi*, even by some eminent in the Church at that time, and by them (he supposeth) held to be lawful. And it may as well be thought, the Law for the Sabbath might sometime (within that *Two Thousand Five Hundred Years*) be neglected and forgotten; as that of *Marriage*; In a time when there was no writing (that we know of) to preserve it. And, if once forgotten, it could never (as to that *Seventh* day) be recovered.

And I would ask that Gentleman, In case the day should chance to have been sometime forgotten, (as is very possible and not unlikely,) and that after such time (upon finding the *Book of the Law*, as in *Josiah's* time *2 Kings* 22. 8. which had been lost) it did appear that a Sabbath should have been kept, but was not, (as was there the case of the *Pass-over*, *Chap.* 23. 21.) What doth this Gentleman think (in such case) should be done? Must they never Restore the Sabbath because they do not know the day? Or must they begin upon a *New Account*? I should think this latter; (and that it would be warranted by the *Fourth Commandment*;) notwithstanding his Objection, No other day (but the *Seventh* from the Creation) is Commanded; No Promise to the Observance of any other; nor Threatning for the Omission.

Indeed in our days when so great a part of the World reckon by Weeks, and we be stored with Astronomical Tables adjusted to the Motions of the Sun, Moon and Stars, and many Celestial Observations, (as for Instance, that such a Year, such a Day, of such a Month there was an Eclipse on Monday morning, or the like) 'twere more easy to rectify such an intermission. But in those days, when there was nothing of all this, nor so much as the use of Writing (that we know of) older than *Moses*; There was no way to rectify an interrupted Tradition.

All which is not said to disparage the Observation of the Sabbath day (for which I have as great Veneration as he that pleads for the *Saturday* Sabbath,) But only to shew, that we can be at no Certainty, (and scarce a Conjecture,) which is the First, Second, or Seventh day of the Week in a continued Circulation of Weeks from the Creation. And consequently I cannot think that the great stress of the Fourth Commandment is to be understood of just that Seventh day in every such Week from the Creation (which I doubt cannot be known) But rather that there should be a Weekly Sabbath; that is, after Six days of Work, the Seventh should be a Holy Rest, and then, after another Six days of Work, the Seventh should be again a Holy Rest; and so continu-

tinu-

tinually; which is as truly observed in the Sunday-Sabbath, as in that of Saturday.

As when God requires the Tenth of our Increase; it is not meant of the Tenth in Order (for it should rather be the First in Order, for he requires the First-fruits) but the Tenth in Proportion; So here the Seventh.

And this Author knows very well, that it is signally noted by Expositors on the Fourth Commandment, and other Writers about the Sabbath, That this Commandment begins with Remember to keep Holy the Sabbath-day, or the day of Rest, (not the Seventh day; much less the Seventh day of the Week from the first Creation;) And what is that day of Rest, the next Words tell us, Six days shalt thou labour, but the Seventh is the Sabbath, &c. That is, after Six days of Labour, the Seventh shall be a day of Rest. And in the close of that Commandment (*Ex.* 20. 11.) our Bibles have it wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day (not as we commonly repeat it, the Seventh day) and hallowed it. The Reason given to inforce it is, For in Six days the Lord made Heaven and Earth &c. and rested the Seventh day, and accordingly should we, after Six days of Work have a Seventh day of Rest, and so onward.

If he thinks that to make a difference, that we now reckon our Weeks to begin with the day of Rest, and after that, Six Working days (which in a continued Circulation comes all to one,) I will allow that Gentleman (if that will please him better) to begin the Week on Monday, and then Sunday will be the Seventh. The Commandment says nothing of the Seventh day of the Week in a continued Succession from the Creation; but the Seventh day after Six days of Labour.

And whereas he observes (and would lay great weight upon it) that it is (as he begin) the Seventh (the article *he* answering to our *the*) not a Seventh. 'Tis very true, and very proper so to be. For the meaning is not that, after Six days of Labour, there should be a Seventh for Rest no matter when; but the Seventh day, that is, the next day after those Six.

But it is not said the Seventh in Course from the Creation. Just as when it is said, a Male-Child is to be Circumcised the Eighth day, it is not meant of an Eighth day in Course from the Creation; but, the Eighth day from the Birth. And in like manner *Ex.* 12. 16. In the Seventh day there shall be a holy Convocation; it is not meant of the Seventh day of the Week from the Creation; but on the Seventh day of the Feast of unleavened Bread, what ever

B

day

day of the Week that happen to be. And *Exod. 16. 5, 25.* The *Sixth* and *Seventh* day there mentioned, seem plainly to be, not the *Sixth* and *Seventh* in course from the *Creation* (which I doubt was not then known) but from the *first raining of Manna*, ver. 4. 5.

He'll say perhaps, the Jews observed such *Seventh* day from the *Creation*, and that was their *Sabbath*. But that is more than he or I know, or any man living. They had I grant, a Circulation of *Seven days*, but from what *Epocha* we cannot tell. And when *Moses* tells them (on the *Sixth day*) *Ex. 16. 23. To-morrow is the Rest of the Holy Sabbath.* It seems to be the fixing of a new *Epocha* (from the first raining of *Manna*) and then all his Arguments, from the continual Observation of the *Seventh* day from the *Creation* till that time, are at an end. Whether this (from the first raining of *Manna*) be the same with that from the *Creation*; no man can tell. And there is *Six to One* odds that it is not.

Now, that there is a new Course of Sabbaths (from a new beginning) whereof this *Seventh* day from the first raining of *Manna* is the *First*, and not a continuation of a former Course hitherto observed without interruption; seems farther evident from this consideration, Because, if this were but a continuation of that uninterrupted Course of Sabbaths, then the next *Seventh* day before it, would have been a *Sabbath* also, and to have been in like manner observed; that is, the next day before the first raining of *Manna*. But, on that day we find (*Exod. 16. 12, 13.*) *the Quails came up and covered the Camp*, without any Prohibition to gather them. If therefore they might not (now) gather *Manna*, because it was the *Sabbath*; but might (before) gather *Quails*; it should seem, that was not a *Sabbath*.

And if it be not allowed, upon occasion, to fix a new *Epocha*; then if the Circulation of Weeks from the beginning of the World (which was then above 2500 years old) did ever chance to have been interrupted, and the day forgotten, (as in all likelihood it might be in *Egypt*, if not long before) or if ever after it should chance so to be (as in the days of *Josiah* when the *Book of the Law* was lost, and the *Pass-over* forgotten); men must never keep a *Sabbath* thenceforth. For then all his own Arguments return upon him; No other day is Commanded ('tis Will-worship) no Promise to the Observance, no Threatning for the Neglect.

I should rather think, if that day were unknown (as I believe it is) Any day were better than None at all. For God's Commands do more respect the Substance of the Duty than the Circum-

cumstance of Time, especially if they cannot both be had.

Circumcision was to be Administred on the *Eighth* day, according to the Institution, (I do not mean the *Eighth day of the Week*, but the *Eighth day of the Childs Age*; and therefore on the same day of the Week on which the Child was Born.) But if by Accident or Default it were omitted, it might be done any day after, rather than not at all. *Abraham* we know was 99 years old, and *Ismael* 13 when they were Circumcised, (and what was the Age of other Males in *Abraham's* Family, we cannot tell;) and a Profelyte, at any Age, was to be Circumcised; (though perhaps it were not remembered on what day of the Week he was Born;) and those who were born in the Wilderness for Forty years together, were all Circumcised at once, *Josh. 5. 4, 5, 9.* (though not all born on the same day of the Week.)

The Pass-over was appointed to be eaten standing, with their Loyns girt, their Shoes on their feet, and their Staffs in their hand, as in haste to be gone *Ex. 12.* Yet our Saviour seemeth to have Eaten it Sitting, or rather Lying. And none of them were to stir out of doors till morning, *Ex. 12. 22.* Yet Christ and his Disciples went out the same night to the mount of Olives, and thence to *Gethsemane*, *Mat. 26. 30, 36.*

The Shew-bread was to be eaten by the Priests only: yet our Saviour observes that *David* did eat of it (on a special occasion) without blaming him for so doing.

The *Rechabites* are commended *Jer. 31.* for obeying the Command of *Jonathan* their Father, not to drink Wine, nor build Houses, but to dwell in Tents &c. Yet did they, upon *Nebuchadnezzar's* Invasion, quit their Tents and repair to *Jerusalem*; nor is it reputed a Disobedience.

The *Paschal Lamb* was to be killed the *Fourteenth day of the First Month at Evening*: Yet if we consider how little knowledge they had in those days, of the Sun and Moons motions, and if we consider what the Jewish Writers tell us of their very uncertain Method of judging, which was the *First Month*, and which the *Fourteenth day* of that Month, we shall find they were at great uncertainties, as to the just day; yet was not the Service thereof to be neglected, upon pretence there was danger of missing the right day.

For they had not Almanacks in those days, as we have now, to tell us before hand when will be a new Moon. But (if we may believe the Jewish Writers) their manner was, about the time when they expected a New-Moon, to send men to watch for it on

the Top of some Hill or high place; and he who could first discover a New-Moon, was to tell the Priest, and he to *blow the Trumpet* to give the People notice that there was a New-Moon, (much like our Custom at *Oxford*, at the time of the *Affizes*, to set some on *St. Maries Steeple* to watch when the Judges are coming, and then to Ring the *Great Bell* to give notice to those concerned that the Judges are at hand;) But, in case of Cloudy Weather, if in three days time from their first Expectation no man could see a New-Moon, they did then venture (but not before) to blow the Trumpet without seeing it, which must needs cause a great uncertainty; and the same Moon sooner seen at one place than at another, and the Pass-over kept accordingly. And 'tis manifest in the Story of our Saviours last Pass-over, that he kept it on one day and the Jews on another (perhaps he about a Fortnight before, might see a New-Moon, a day sooner than they did.) So great uncertainty there was at that time, as to the particular day, though the Institution was punctual for the *Fourteenth* day of the *First Month*. And the like uncertainty there was as to all their *Feasts of New-Moons*.

And even in our days, when the Motions of the Sun and Moon are much better known than at that time they were, we are far from being exact in point of time. Our Rule for *Easter* is much the same with theirs for the *Pass-over*; The Rule in general is this, *The Sunday next after the Fourteenth day of the First Month is to be Easter day*. But when we come to make particular application, we do strangely miss of our Rule. And our Paschal Tables which should direct us, do put us farther out than if we had none at all.

For (by reason that we take the length of our common year a little too long, by about Eleven minutes of an hour, and the length of our Months too long also;) since the time that those Tables were made, 'tis well known that the beginning of our Ecclesiastical First Month, is Ten or Eleven days later than that of the Heavens; and our Ecclesiastical New-Moons and Full-Moons, is later by Four or Five days than those of the Heavens. Whereby we do very often mistake the *Month*, and yet ofner the true *Week*, for keeping of *Easter*. And though Pope Gregory the Eighth, did (somewhat more than an Hundred years ago) somewhat rectify the Calendar, yet both Papists and Protestants do observe, some the Newer *Gregorian*, and some the Older *Julian* account, and (in the United Provinces of the *Netherlands*) one Town observes one account, and the next the other account

and

and accordingly keep their *Easters* (if at all) at Three, Four or Five Weeks distance.

And so for Christmas-day. 'Tis not agreed amongst Chronologers either what Year, or what Month, much less what day of that Month, our Saviour was born, yet we keep *December 25th* in memory of his Birth, as supposing him to have been then born. Yet we are at so great uncertainty, that we reckon the year 1692 from his *Circumcision*, to begin the First of *January*; but the same year as from his *Conception*, not till the 25th of *March* next following; as if his Birth and Circumcision had been a quarter of a year before his Conception.

And if we be now at so great an uncertainty, in so short a Period as from the Birth of Christ, I do not think the Jews could be punctual, as to a day, in observing their Pass-over; and much less, as to a day from the Creation of the World.

He'll say perhaps, that *Easter* and *Christmas* being of humane Institution, it is not much matter though we miss the day, nor much matter perhaps whether it be kept or no. Be it so; But the Pass-over was of Divine Institution; yet were they at a great uncertainty, and might chance to miss more than a day or two; yet was not the Duty to be therefore neglected. The mistake of a Day was of much less concernment than the neglect of the Duty; As was the *Tithing of Mint and Annise*, than the *weightier things of the Law*. These little Circumstances are but *Shadows*, in comparison of the *Substance*, as the Comparison is *Col. 2. 17*.

Which is not said to encourage any one to violate the Laws of God, even in little things, (for we find God sometimes very severe even in such; as in the Case of *Uzzah's touching the Ark*, and *Nadab and Abihu's offering strange Fire*; for Reasons best known to himself, of which we are not aware.) But onely to shew that the Substantials of a Duty are to be regarded more than Circumstantials; and these upon occasion to give way to those. And in such Cases (if it were a fault) the Prayer of *Hezekiah* (*2 Chr. 30. 18.*) is to take place, *The good Lord pardon every one that prepareth his heart to seek God, though he be not cleansed according to the Purification of the Sanctuary*. And his Service was accepted, though (as it is expressly noted) *they did eat the Pass-over otherwise than as it was written*. And, in the *Second Month*, in stead of the *First*.

And doubtless in the present case, If we do not know (as certainly we do not) which is the *First* or *Seventh* day in a continual

Circu-

Circulation from the Creation, it is much better to keep a Weekly Sabbath on any day of the Week whatever, than to keep none at all, and much more agreeable to the true meaning of the Fourth Commandment.

All which is said, partly by way of Caution, not to be forward, upon slight grounds, to disturb the Peace and settled practise of the whole Christian Church at this day.

Partly to take off what he would have to be admitted but cannot be proved, that the Seventh day in a continued Circulation of Weeks from the first Creation, was observed as the Weekly Sabbath, from the Creation to the Flood; from thence to *Abraham*; from thence to *Israel's* coming out of *Egypt*; and from thence till after the Resurrection of Christ. Which I think is impossible for any man to know.

And partly to satisfy what he objects from the Fourth Commandment. Which saith indeed that there is to be a *Rest* on the *Seventh day after Six days of Labour*; but not a word of its being such Seventh day in a continual Circulation of Weeks from the Creation. And therefore we are safe hitherto, for ought I see.

But I'll come up a little nearer to him. He may perhaps tell us, (though I do not find he doth) that the Jews did certainly keep their Weekly Sabbath (at the time of our Saviours death) on what they called the *Seventh day*. If not on the Seventh day of the Week from the Creation (of which we can have no certainty) at least on the Seventh day of the Week, as the Weeks were then reckoned; (which I readily grant him;) and that they had so done for a long time before, and perhaps from the time of giving the Law on Mount *Sinai*. (And it may be so, for ought I know, but we cannot be certain.) And what was then called the *First day of the Week*, was another day from what they called the *Seventh* (which I admit also.) And that, what they called the *Seventh day*, is now what we call *Saturday*; and what they called the *First day* is what we now call *Sunday*. But this, I say, is more than he or I know. He may think so; and so do I; but I am not sure of it.

The reason why I think so, is, because I think that Christ or his Apostles (according to Christs direction) did remove the observation of the Sabbath, from the Seventh to the First day of the Week, and that we have ever since kept the Sabbath as they did, (for I do not know that it hath been since altered,) and as we now keep it on Sunday, so I believe they did; and therefore think that our Sunday is what they called the First day.

And

And if the Apostles did then remove it from their Seventh day to their First day, I presume they had direction from Christ so to do, who after his Resurrection, *shewed himself to them for Forty days, giving Commandments to his Apostles, speaking to them of things pertaining to the Kingdom of God*, Acts 1. 2, 3. And therefore, what they did afterwards in settling the Christian Church, they did (we are to presume) according to such Directions and Commandments of Christ, and this in particular of so removing the Observation of the Sabbath day, if they did remove it, (as I think was done) by his Authority who was *Lord of the Sabbath day*. *Matthew 23. 8. Luke 6. 5.*

But if they did not so remove it; I do not know that it hath since been changed. For I think we keep the same Sabbath which they did; and that the Christian Church hath ever since so done; and doth pretend so to have done, by a constant Tradition ever since. And we therefore think our Sunday to be their First day of the Week, because we think their Sabbath so to have been. But if we mistake in that Tradition, we are (for ought I know) accordingly mistaken in thinking Sunday to be their First day; (For we have nothing but Tradition for either.) And then for ought he can shew (by better than Tradition) to the contrary, our Sunday may be their Seventh day. And then he hath no pretense to quarrel with it.

If he say the Jews do at this day keep Saturday as their Seventh day, I confess they do. But they do no more know which is the Seventh day; than we, which is the First day. And because they find that Christians generally take Sunday to be what was before called the First day, they do accordingly take Saturday to be their Seventh day. But their Tradition is of no greater Authority than ours. All depending upon this, that our Sunday being that Sabbath which we think Christ or his Apostles did appoint, we take it to be the First day, because Christ or his Apostles, by Christs directions) did remove the observation of the Sabbath to that day.

He'll say perhaps, I do not my self think our Sunday to be their Seventh day. And then, why should not our Sabbath be on Saturday as theirs was?

'Tis true, I do not think our Sunday to be their Seventh day. And I have told you the reason why I do not think it; Because I think Christ or his Apostles did change the day, and for that reason only. And for the same reason I think our Sabbath should be as now it is, and as I think it hath been ever since. But if I be mistaken

mistaken in it, I may be mistaken in the other also: But, either way, Sunday is yet to be our Sabbath.

He says, It is no where *expressly said in Scripture*, that the Apostles did thus change it. True, and 'tis no where said in Scripture that our Sunday is not their Seventh day. It may be the same for ought I know, (and for ought he knows) if it were not then changed. Though, because I think the day was then changed, I do therefore think it is not the same. And if it were not changed, then all the difference is, that what they called the Seventh day of their Week, we call the First day of our Week. Which, if the Author do not like, he may call Monday the First day, and then Sunday will be the Seventh, as it was before.

But I say further; There be many things, even as to the Worship of God, which we may reasonably think to have been done, though it be not *expressly said so*; but only to be collected by consequence from what is said.

'Tis no where said expressly, that, after the First Sabbath of God himself, (*Gen. 2. 2.*) any other Sabbath was ever kept before that in *Exod. 16.* which was above Two Thousand and Five Hundred Years after. Yet this Author would have us think it was *observed* all that while; and that it was *commanded* so to be, which yet is no where said expressly. But a slight presumption, it seems, may serve his turn, but not ours.

'Tis known that God was Worshipped by *Sacrifices* very early; at least as early, as that of *Cain* and *Abel*; and that this Worship was accepted of God, at least that of *Abel*; And therefore I suppose this Author would have us think it was *Commanded*. (not a meer *Will-worship*, without any Direction or Institution from God.) Yet we are no where told, of any such Command or Institution.

We may say the like of *Jacob's* consecrating a *Pillar*, by *pouring Oil* upon it; (*Gen. 28. 18.* though we do not find mention, before that time, of any direction for any such *Consecration* (of things or persons) by *Anointing*, or *Pouring on of Oil*.)

We have also reason to think there was some Command from God, that the Fire for *Incense* should be taken from the *Altar*, (or somewhat of like nature;) else *Nadab* and *Abihu* would not have been destroyed for *Offering strange Fire*. Yet we are no where *told expressly* of any such Command.

We have no particular Command (that I know of) for Baptizing of Infants, nor any particular mention in Scripture of any such Baptized. Yet I do not know that this Author would have

have us thence infer, that none such were baptized, or that they ought not so to be.

Nor have we any express mention of *Womens* receiving the other Sacrament; nor any express Command for their so doing (any more than for Females being Circumcised) yet I know not any who doth therefore think they ought not.

We know that Children were reputed Members of the Church of God before Christ's coming; and we have no reason to think that Christ did put them out (and make them in a worse condition than they were before) but rather would have them continue so to be; and seems to favour it, by that of *suffer little Children to come to me, and forbid them not; for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven* *Mar. 10. 14.* and did accordingly embrace them as such. And therefore, as (*before*) they were *Circumcised*, (which was then the Sacrament of Admition;) So they should (*now*) be *Baptized* (which is our Sacrament of Admition.) And when we find whole Families to be Baptized, we cannot think but that there might be little Children in some of them; (and more likely so than otherwise.) And we are, in such cases, to practise according to what we may judge by what we find. We find also that *Women* were *Baptized* (though not *Circumcised* in the Jewish Church,) yet we have no Command for so doing. And because there seems to be the same reason for *Womens* receiving the other Sacrament as for *Men*, (and we find nothing to the contrary,) therefore we do now practise it (as the most likely to be God's Will, according to the Light we now have) though we find in Scripture neither express Precept nor Example for it.

In like manner it is no Argument that Christ or his Apostles did not make such a change, because in Scripture it is not expressly said so. 'Tis enough if we there find so much as that we may thence reasonably Judge they did so; and more likely so than not.

Now I meet with so much there to that purpose, as makes me judge they did. And so much as (I believe) would make this Gentleman so to think, if he were not otherwise prepossessed with prejudice; and with a great fondness to find out somewhat where-with to find fault.

I find that Christ, on the very day of his Resurrection (which was the *First day of their Week*) did not only appear to the good *Women* at the Sepulchre (who sought him there) and declare to them the *Resurrection* (which was then to *Preach* a new Doctrine, of which they were not before aware) and *bid them* tell it to his Disciples: But did also the same day himself declare it to

Two of them going to *Emmaus* (*Luk. 24.*) *Preaching* to them, from *Moses and the Prophets* ver. 25, 26, 27. The Doctrine of his *Death and Resurrection* (which was to them a new Doctrine, which till then they did not understand,) for (as the Phrase there is) did *Expound to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself* ver. 27. which I think, was *Preaching*; and did open to them the Scriptures (*ver. 31.*) concerning those points; (which was a Sabbath-days exercise, though perhaps they did not at first so apprehend it) and did, I take it, celebrate with them the Sacrament of the *Lords Supper* (and perhaps the first time after the first Institution) for so much seems to be implied in those words (*ver. 30.*) *he took bread and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them;* and (*ver. 35.*) *he was known to them by breaking of Bread.* (for that Sacrament used to be designed by *breaking of Bread.*) And if our Author could but shew so much as this, once done, in the first 2500 years from the Creation, on the Seventh day, it would be a better proof for the Celebration of the *Seventh-day Sabbath* in that time, than all that he offers at to that purpose. And the Effect of his *Preaching* was on them so much that *their eyes were opened, and their heart did burn within them, while he talked with them by the way, and opened to them the Scriptures,* ver. 31, 32. and they returned presently (the same hour) to *Jerusalem*, to acquaint the Disciples (who were there assembled) with this good news.

If he tell us that this Journey from *Jerusalem* to *Emmaus* (being about *Threescore Furlongs*, near Eight of our Miles) and back again, was more than a Sabbath-days Journey; I confess it was (unless upon an urgent occasion) if they had known it to be a Sabbath-day, when they undertook the Journey; but this then they knew not; nor was it therefore, on this occasion, a breach of the Sabbath so to do.

If he say, *Christ* knew it (though they did not) if it were now a Sabbath. 'Tis true; he did so. But *Christ*, I presume, in that estate (after his Resurrection) could Travel without Pain, and therefore without breaking the Sabbath. Or if it were painful; he tells us *Mat. 12. 5.* that the *Priests in the Temple* profane the Sabbath and are blameless; that is, they take as much pains of labour in killing, dressing, and offering the Sacrifices, as a Butcher would do in killing and dressing his meat; which would in the Butcher be a culpable profanation of the Sabbath; but is not so in the Priests, because theirs is *Religious Service*. Nor doth this Author think that in *Preaching*, though it be a Labour, the Minister doth thereby break the Sabbath. And such was *Christ's* im-

employment here. And, then, whether he Preach Standing, or Preach Walking, 'tis all one.

And if he say farther, that the Disciples at *Jerusalem* (not then knowing this) could not be thought then to have met upon a Sabbath-day account: I grant this also, that their then meeting was Providential (as was that of the Two other meeting *Christ* in their Journey,) yet they might before they parted (as did those others) know more of it than at their first coming together. And *Christ* knew before what he meant to do, though they did not, and did accordingly so order it by his Providence. And though they did not know that it was thenceforth to be kept as a Sabbath, yet may they well be supposed to be employed on Religious Work, upon what Tidings the Women had before brought them (of *Christ's* being Risen) waiting for what directions they should farther receive from *Christ*.

To this purpose let us consider what was further done at this meeting. While these Two were telling the rest what had happened to them; *As they thus spake* (*ver. 36.*) *Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and said Peace be unto you:* And did (by shewing them his hands, and feet, and their handling of him, and seeing him eat before them) convince them that he was indeed Risen from the Dead, and that it was not only a Spirit that appeared to them (*ver. 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42.*) And did again, to them, Preach the same Doctrine which he had before preached to the Two; That it was what he had told them while he was yet with them. (though they did not understand it,) That this was but what was written in the Law of *Moses*, and the Prophets, and the Psalms concerning him; and opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures; That it was thus written, that it behoved *Christ* to suffer and to rise from the Dead the Third day; and that Repentance and Remission of Sins was to be Preached in his Name amongst all Nations; whereof they were to be his Witnesses, and Apostles (*ver. 44, 45, 46, 47, 48.*) And did renew his Promise of sending the Holy Ghost, and Power from on high (*ver. 49.*) He did moreover at the same meeting, not only upbraid them for their unbelief, (*Mark 16. 14.*) but did Authorize them with a solemn Commission for the Work they were to be sent about; to Go into all the World, and Preach the Gospel to every Creature; that he who believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he who believeth not shall be damned; (*ver. 15, 16.*) and a Power to work Miracles (*ver. 17, 18.*) in confirmation of that Doctrine.

And to the same purpose, *John 20. 19.* The same day at Evening

(in which he before appeared to *Mary Magdalen* and the *rest*) being the *First day of the Week* (the very day of his Resurrection) where the *Disciples* were assembled (at a private meeting) for fear of the *Jews* (the door being shut) *Jesus* came, and stood in the midst of them, and gave them his Solemn Benediction, saying unto them, *Peace be unto you*; And in Confirmation of his Resurrection, shewed them his hands and his side; (ver. 20.) And then a *Second* time gives them his Solemn Blessing together with his Ordination or Commission for Preaching the Gospel, and Planting the Christian Church, *Jesus* saith to them, *Again, Peace be unto you*; *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you*. And when he had said this, he breathed upon them and said unto them, *Receive the Holy Ghost: Who's soever Sins ye remit, they are remitted to them, and who's soever Sins ye retain, they are retained*, ver. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

All which being put together, seems to me very like the Celebration (if not the Consecration) of a Christian Sabbath, or day of Holy Rest and Religious Service. 'Tis all of it *Sabbatical* Work, and there is a great deal of it.

'Tis not indeed expressly said, That he did bid them thus to meet on such other *First day* of the Week, (as neither is expressly said, *Gen. 2. 3.* that God did then bid *Adam* and *Eve* to keep a Weekly Sabbath, or that he did bid them to offer Sacrifice;) but it is very likely Christ might so order it (and more likely than that he did not.) For, that they did so meet we are sure; and therefore 'tis very likely (if not a strong presumption) that they were bid so to do. For so we find it *Job. 20. 26.* After *Eight days* (that is, as we commonly speak in English, on that day Sennight) his *Disciples* were again within, and *Thomas* with them (who before was absent) the door being shut; then *Jesus* came and stood in the midst and said *Peace be unto you*, (as he had done the Week before,) and satisfied *Thomas*, who before doubted.

So that we have here Two Solemn meetings of the *Disciples*, Two Weeks together, (the Two first after his Resurrection) on the *First day of the Week*; and Christ with them on both. (And I am sure we have not more for the First Sabbath, *Gen. 2. 3.*) On how many more such Sabbaths he so met with them, I cannot tell. That he oft appeared to them (during the Forty days of his abode on Earth after his Resurrection) we cannot doubt, and its like it might be on these days.

The Cavil which here he makes to this place, is so weak, that I am sorry to see it from one who would seem to be serious. As if *Eight days* after, or after *Eight days*, were not the same as what

we

we would say a *Week* after or that day *Sennight* after; For he must needs know, that 'tis not only the Common Scripture Language, but the general Language of Latine and Greek Writers, to reckon *Inclusively*; that is, to take in both the extremes; and so it is even at this day (I think) in most Languages except English. What we call a *Sennight*, the French call *huit jours* (Eight days) and what we say a *Fortnight*, is with them *Quinze jours* (Fifteen days;) and so in all manner of reckoning. A *Fourth*, a *Fifth*, an *Eighth*, a *Fifteenth*, and other *Intervals* in *Musick* are always so reckoned. What we call a *Third-day-Agave*, the Latins call a *Quartan*; and what we call every other day, they call a *Tertian*. So they call *Secundo Calendas* (i. e. *Secundo die ante Calendas*) what we would say one day (not two days) before the *Calends*; and they call *tertio Calendas*, what is with us two days (not three days) before the *Calends*. So *nudius tertius* is what we would say two days ago; and *nudius quartus* is in our Language Three days ago (not Four.) So *Mark 8. 31.* where Christ speaks of himself, that the Son of Man should be killed and after three days rise again, that is, on the Third day after (inclusively taken) or after the Third day is come; whereas, according to the sense this Author would put upon the words, it should rather have been said after one day (for there was but one day between his Death and Resurrection;) And it is the same in sense, with what he says *Joh. 2. 19.* Destroy this Temple, (speaking of his Body) And in Three days I will raise it up, *in tres diebus*, or as *Mat. 26. 61.* *in tres diebus*, that is, the Third after (inclusively.) And *Mat. 27. 63.* they tell *Pilate*, This Deceiver said, After Three days will I rise again, *post tres dies* (meaning thereby the Third day after, inclusively,) and therefore they pray, that the Sepulchre may be made sure till the third Day. Whereas, if (as our Author would reckon upon his fingers) by after Three days; were to be understood, when Three whole days after that should be past, they need not set their Watch before the Fourth or Fifth day. Thus Christ's Ascension is said to be Forty days after his Resurrection, (speaking of a Scripture Computation, in Scripture Language,) which in our ordinary manner of Speech is but Nine and Thirty. For Ascension-Thurs'day (if Easter-day be not reckoned for one) is but 39 days after Easter. Upon a like Account that Christ tells us *Mat. 12. 40.* that as *Jonas* was three days and three nights in the Whales Belly, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the Earth. Not Three whole days, and Three whole nights; but, till the Third was begun. For by day

day and night is here understood the *24 hours*, or what we now call the *Artificial day*, consisting of 24 hours; day and night; and till such Third day (or *24 hours*) was begun, Christ rested in the Grave; otherwise, though he were in the Grave (part of) Three days, yet but Two nights.

So Luke 2. 21. When Eight days were accomplished (for the Circumcision of the Child) they called his name Jesus; that is, upon the Eighth day, inclusively; reckoning the day of Birth for the first, and the day of Circumcision for the last (of the Eight days) which with Six whole days between make Eight. Whereas, if Eight whole days had been fully past; Christ had been Circumcised the Tenth day. The sense being the same with that concerning John the Baptist, Luke 1. 19. On the Eighth day they came to Circumcise the Child. So here, After Eight days, that is on the Eighth day, or after the Eighth day was come. And this, I think, is the constant Language of Scripture every where. And his Objection needs no other Answer, but, that St. John did not speak English.

And I cannot but think (however he please thus to Object) that himself doth believe this; after Eight days, to be here meant of the First day of the next Week, (and he should have been so candid as to own it.) And that *post Octo dies* is the same in sense with *Octo post diebus*, that is, the Eighth day after, (reckoning the present day for one,) and that it is so to be understood in this place. We should not, in a serious Enquiry, press what possibly might be, but what we truly think is the meaning. A Lawyer at the Bar may fairly propose For his Client, what possibly may be the sense of such or such a Clause. But a Judge on the Bench (and a Counsellor, To his Client,) is to consider what really is the sense of Words in question. I dare appeal to himself, whether (in his own thoughts) he do not think after Eight days, here to signify the same, as after Eight days were accomplished, Luk. 2. 21. And, if so, then this is rather to Wrangle, than to Dispute fairly.

Before I dismiss this place, it is not amiss to take more particular notice about what time it was that Mary Magdalen and the other Women came to the Sepulchre on the day of Christ's Resurrection. 'Tis said Luke 23. 55. When they beheld the Sepulchre and how the body was laid, (on the sixth day at night whereon he was Crucified) they returned and prepared Spices and Ointments, and rested the Sabbath day according to the Commandment. And in the next words Luk. 24. 1. Now upon the First day of the Week, very early in the morning, they came to the Sepulchre

bringing the Spices which they had prepared. In Mat. 28. 1. In the end of the Sabbath when it began to dawn toward the First day of the Week. In Mark 16. 1. When the Sabbath was past, very early in the morning the First day of the Week, they came to the Sepulchre at the rising of the Sun, or by Sun-rising. And Joh. 20. 1. The First day of the Week, early, when it was yet dark, they came to the Sepulchre. (Perhaps all the Women did not come just at the same time; but were all there by Sun-rising.) But the Body was raised before they came, as is agreed by all the Evangelists.

Where I observe First that the Sabbath, according to their Account, did not end till toward the morning of the next day. The end of the Sabbath, or when the Sabbath was past, was early in the morning, before the Sun-rising, while the day did begin to dawn, and while it was yet dark. Very early indeed in the morning, but yet not till morning, (not in the Evening over night.) And therefore (without disputing how the day was reputed to begin in the time of Moses) 'tis manifest that, at this time, as well the Sabbath as other days was by them reckoned not from (the beginning of) the Evening to (the beginning of) the Evening, but rather (according to the Rom. account) from Midnight to Midnight.

For 'tis manifest that it was toward Evening of the Sixth day before the Crucifixion was over; For it was some while after the Ninth hour (that is, after our Three a Clock) that he cried with a loud voice and gave up the Ghost, Mark 15. 34, 37. And it was yet later, when they brake the Legs of the two Thieves, (that they might not remain on the Cross upon the Sabbath) but only pierced his side, because he was already dead, Joh. 19. 31, 32, 33, 34. And later yet when Joseph of Arimathea begged his Body and buried it. For 'tis expressly said, When Even was come there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, and begged the body of Jesus, and when he had taken the Body, he wrapped it in a clean linnen Cloth and buried it in his own new Tomb, Mat. 27. 57, 58, 59, 60. Mark 15. 42, 43, 44, 45, 46. Luk. 23. 51, 52, 53.

But, though Even were come before this time, yet the Sabbath was not begun, for so it followeth, Luk. 23. 54. that day was the Preparation and the Sabbath drew on.

And after this, ver. 55, 56. the Women who beheld the Sepulchre, and how the Body was laid, returned and prepared Spices and Ointments (the same night) but rested the Sabbath day according to the Commandment; And by this time it must needs be pretty late at night, while yet the Sabbath was not begun. That is, I suppose not till Midnight of the Sixth day.

Ner

Nor was the Sabbath ended when Evening began on the Seventh day. For if so, the Women might that night have brought and applyed their *Spices and Ointments* which they had prepared the night before. For they had as much time so to do, after the Evening was begun that night (if the Sabbath were now ended) as they had, to do what was done the night before; after that Evening was then begun. Nothing hindered them but because the Sabbath was not yet done, and they were to *rest the Sabbath day according to the Commandment*. But, so soon as well they could, *when the Sabbath was ended*, they came *early*, the next morning, while it was yet dark. And might as well have come the night before, if the Sabbath had ended when the evening began.

I add farther, If the Sabbath had ended at the evening of the Seventh day, and the First day of the Week had then begun (as this author would have it,) Christ might have risen that night (for it would then have been the *Third day*;) and not have stay'd in the grave (for the third day) till the next morning, which yet we know he did.

'Tis manifest therefore that the First day of the Week did begin from the middle of the night, not from the First Evening of the Seventh day. And that Christ was risen *very early in the morning* of that *First day* while it was yet dark.

We are next to Consider how long that First day lasted. After Christ was risen *early* in the morning while it was yet dark, (how early that was, we cannot tell, but it was in the Morning, not over night;) he appeared first to *Mary Magdalen*, and the Women who went to the Sepulchre; they, as they were directed carried news of it to the Disciples; and *when they were going*, (Mat. 28. 11.) *the Watch came into the City and shewed to the High Priests the things which were done; who calling a Council, gave the Souldiers Money to say, His Disciples came and stole him away while they were asleep; undertaking to secure them in case the Governour should come to hear it.*

Upon this news being brought by the Women to the Disciples, Two of them, from the rest, went to the Sepulchre to enquire into the business; and brought an account of it to the rest, who were Astonished at it.

And all this happened before the Two Disciples began their Journey to *Emmaus*; for they discoursed of it by the way, and told it to *Jesus* who fell into their Company, Luk. 24. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24. Now their Journey from *Jerusalem* to *Emmaus*, was about *Threescore Furlongs*, ver. 13. which our Author rightly computes

putes to be about *Seven miles and an half*, of our miles; which they *Travelled on foot*, for 'tis said *they walked*, (Mark 16. 12.) and *Jesus* in their company, Preaching to them (out of *Moses and the Prophets*) the Doctrine of Christ's Death and Resurrection.

When they came near to *Emmaus* it was towards Evening, and *the day far spent*, (Luk. 24. 29.) they did there abide for some time, and *Jesus* with them, continuing to Preach on the same Subject, and was at length known to them by *breaking of Bread*, ver. 30, 35. After which they returned to *Jerusalem* and told these things to the *Disciples then gathered together*, ver. 33. By which time (having now walked another *Seven miles and an half*) we may reasonably suppose it to be pretty late at night; For, when they first approached to *Emmaus* it was then so late, as that it was not thought convenient (unless upon some such great occasion) to Travel further, ver. 28.

Yet, after they were come back to *Jerusalem*, Christ then appeared himself to the Disciples, *blessing them, reproaching their unbelief, confirming their Faith*, giving them *Instructions*, and *Commission for Preaching the Gospel, and Planting the Christian Church*. And it was yet but *the same day at Evening, being the First day of the Week*, (Joh. 20. 19.) on which he rose: but, now late at night, *when the doors were shut*; that is, (if I mistake not) so late as that it was time to shut up doors as men use to do towards bed-time. Not as if Christ came in through the Key-hole (any more than did the Two Disciples that came from *Emmaus*) or did Penetrate the doors, (as the Papiists would have us think in favour of their *Transubstantiation*;) For they were not so shut but that they could be opened again (upon occasion) to let him in (as they had been to let-in those Two that came from *Emmaus*) as well as to let-in *Peter* (late at night) Act. 12. 16.

So that from *very early* in the Morning while it was dark, till *very late night* and about *Mid-night*, was the same day, the *first day of the Week*. 'Tis manifest therefore that about our Saviours time, according to the Computation of the New-Testament, both the Jews and the Four Evangelists did reckon their days, from mid-night to mid-night. And if they did not so reckon, Christ could not be said (Mat. 12. 40.) to be *three days and three nights in the heart of the earth*. For it was Evening, when *Joseph* begged the Body of *Jesus*, and later yet before he had buried it, and yet this must be reckoned *part of the Sixth day*, else he had not been *three days* in the Grave, or heart of the earth.

And I think they were so reckoned in the times of the Old Te-

flament also. Which though it be not so much to the present purpose, yet (if you will pardon this digression) I will tell you why I think so. It is I know an Opinion taken up by some (and I find it is grown pretty current even amongst Learned men) that the Jews in the time of the Old Testament did reckon their days from Evening to Evening (whether they mean from Sun-set to Sun-set, or from Six a Clock to Six a Clock, I cannot tell, nor perhaps are they all agreed as to that point.) But I take it to be a mistake; which being at first taken up without sufficient ground, hath since passed (without further examination) from hand to hand.

We find *Exod. 12. 6.* the Pass-over was to be killed in the First month, on the *Fourteenth day in the Evening*; which I think is agreed by all to be the Evening at the end of the Fourteenth day, (not that at the end of the Thirteenth,) for the next morning was the Fifteenth day; which Evening therefore belonged to the Fourteenth day.

But it is noted in the Margin of our Bibles, that it is, in the Hebrew, *between the two Evenings*. You'll ask perhaps, what are those *two Evenings*: I'll tell you what I think they are.

The word *Day*, you know, is taken in a double sense. Sometimes for (what we call) the *Natural* day (as it is contradistinguished to night) from Sun-rising to Sun-setting: sometimes for (what we call) the *Artificial* day (or *ὥρῃς*) so as to take in both day and night. Our Saviour tells us *there are Twelve hours in the day*; meaning the *Natural* day. But in the *Artificial* day (of which we are now speaking) there be *Four and Twenty* hours. Some please to call that the *Natural* day, which I call the *Artificial* (for all do not use the words in the same sense) But that matters not, so long as we understand one another.

Now by the word *Evening* is understood *the end of the day*. Which, as to the *Natural* day, is at *Sun-set*; but as to the *Artificial* day, it is (I think) at *Mid-night*. And consequently, *between the two Evenings*, is as much as to say, *after Sun-set, and before Mid-night*. And this is what, in our Language, we commonly call the *Evening*, which is in the Hebrew *between the two Evenings*, (that is, between the end of the *Natural* day, and the end of the *Artificial* day:) and within this time was the Pass-over to be *Killed, Roasted and Eaten*; *Nothing of it was to remain till the Morning*; that is, not after *Mid-night*; for as soon as *Mid-night* is past *Morning* begins. And within this time all *Leaven* was to be put away; that is, before the *Mid-night* of the Fourteenth day. Which is so fair an account of it, as that we

need

need not scruple to embrace it. And it was the *Fifteenth* day, that was the *first day* of the *Feast of Unleavened bread*; (all *Leaven* being put away before *Mid-night*;) and this *Fifteenth* day was to be kept as a *Sabbath*, and a *Holy Feast to the Lord*, ver. 14. (on what ever day of the Week it chanced to fall.) And so was the *One and Twentieth* day, which was the last of those *Seven* days: *Seven days shall ye eat Unleavened-bread; even the first day ye shall put away (or shall have put away) leaven out of your house. And in the First day there shall be an Holy Convocation, and in the Seventh day there shall be an Holy Convocation; no manner of Work shall be done in them, save that which every man shall eat; (that is they are to be kept as a Sabbath or day of Holy rest;)* ver. 15, 16. From the *Fourteenth day at Evening* till the *One and Twentieth day at Evening*, ver. 18. that is, from the Fourteenth day at *Mid-night*, till the *One and Twentieth* at *Mid-night*. And in like manner, *Lev. 23. 32. from Even to Even, or Night to Night*, that is, from *Mid-night* to *Mid-night*; or from the end of one *Evening* to the end of the next *Evening*. So in *Levit. 23. 5. and Numb. 28. 16, 17. In the Fourteenth day of the First month is the Pass-over of the Lord; and in the fifteenth day of this month is the feast; Seven days shall unleavened bread be eaten, &c.* Where it is manifest that the *fourteenth* day which is the *Lords Pass-over* is another day from the *fifteenth* which is the *first day of the Feast*. For I will pass through the land of Egypt (saith God) *this night*, (that is the night of the Fourteenth day) and will smite all the first-born in the land of Egypt, *Ex. 12. 12.* And what time of the night it was, we are told ver. 28. *And it came to pass at Mid-night the Lord smote all the first-born of the land of Egypt.* And to the same purpose *Moses* tells *Pharaoh*, chap. 11. 4, 5, 6, 7, *Thus saith the Lord. About Mid-night will I go out into the midst of Egypt, And the first-born of the land of Egypt shall die, from the first-born of Pharaoh, &c. that ye may know that the Lord hath put a difference between the Egyptians and Israel.* So that the *fourteenth* day, which was the *Lords Pass-over* continued till the *Mid-night* of that day; and then began the *fifteenth* day which was the *first day of the Feast*. Than which I think nothing can be more clear. And *Num. 33. 3. The fifteenth day of the first month is the morrow after the Pass-over.* In like manner, *Deut. 16. 6. Thou shalt Sacrifice the Pass-over at even, at the going down of the Sun, (that is, after the going down of the Sun, or when the Sun is gone down) at the season that thou camest forth out of Egypt, which was about Mid-night, Ex. 12. 21. Ex. 11. 4.*

What he offers from *Gen. 1. 5.* is easily answered. *The evening and the morning were the first day,* (and so of the other days;) Whence he would have it thought, that the day is to begin at the beginning of the Evening. Or (as the Margin tells us it is in the Hebrew) *the evening was, and the morning was, the first day.* Or, *there was evening, and there was morning, day one,* (for in such order the words stand in the Hebrew.) Or, *and was evening; and was morning, day one.* That is, there was in the first day, (and so in the rest) *evening and morning;* or darkness and light; And the Dark is put first, because (beginning the day from Mid-night) the dark is before the Light. And by *day one,* is meant *the first day.*

And it was moreover very agreeable so to reckon. For, supposing Paradise the principal seat of Action; the Sun may reasonably be supposed to be Created (in the middle of the Fourth day, *Gen. 1. 16.*) in the Meridian of that place, (as in its greatest Splendor) or, if not in the Meridian of that place, it must needs be in the Meridian of some place: and wherever that be, the day (of 24 hours) being there half past, it must have begun at Mid-night foregoing. And I doubt not but a Child born on *Saturday night at Ten a Clock,* was to be Circumcised the *next Saturday* (as being the *Eighth day,*) not on the *Sunday after.*

I have insisted the longer on this, because I find him afterward moving another question about what time the Sabbath is to *begin and end,* and lays great stress upon it, as we shall see anon.

Of which I think we need not be further solicitous than to begin and end this day, according as other days are accounted to begin and end in the places where we live. I do not think the *Fourth Commandment* to descend to these Punctilio's.

But, if he think it necessary to be more curious in it; I take it to be very plain from what I have said, that at the time of Christs Death and Resurrection, it was accounted to begin *very early in the morning,* while it was dark, and continue till *very late at night,* according as we now account our days, from Mid-night to Mid-night. But I go on.

We have now found our Saviours *Example,* as to the two First Sundays from his Resurrection (if at least their *first day of the Week* be our *Sunday*) imploying the day in Religious Exercises and Sabbatical Affairs with his Disciples. How many more Sundays he so spent with them we cannot tell. Which Examples of his Two first, with their Imitation of him in others after, (of which we are to speak by and by,) and the Churches practise ever

since

since, looks so like the *Celebration* and *Institution* of a Christian Sabbath, or *day of Holy Rest and Religious Exercise,* as that we may warrantably do the like. I am sure it is more than he can shew for the *Saturday Sabbath* in *Gen. 2. 3.* Save that men are apt to think a small thing an *Institution* and *Jus Divinum* for what they fancy; but, as to what they do not, nothing will serve but Full Express Words.

We have next clear Evidence, of a like *Practise* (consonant to this *Example*) in *Act. 20. 7.* *On the first day of the Week when the Disciples came together to break bread, Paul Preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow, and continued his Speech until Mid-night.* Which is so plain that he is much put to his shifts to avoid it. That there is a *Religious Assembly* of the Disciples, he doth not deny; *Paul was Preaching* very late, even till Mid-night, and they met to *break bread,* which I think is generally agreed by Interpreters, to signify the Celebration of the *Lords Supper;* and I know not well what clearer Character we need demand of a *Religious meeting for Worship,* suitable to the Work of a Sabbath or *Holy Rest.* And it was *ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ὁμέρᾳ,* which I think he will not deny, (though he seem to cavil at it) to signify, *on the first day of the Week.* But he excepts, that the word *ᾠκίζων* here translated *Preached,* is elsewhere render'd *Reasoned* or *Discoursed.* Be it so, and if that word will please him better, let it be so here; he *reasoned, discoursed, treated, or did hold forth;* that I think will not alter the case; and he continued, or held on (*ᾠκίζων*) this *Discourse, this Speech, this Sermon,* (*ἡ λόγον Sermonem*) till Mid-night; (he held on this holding forth till Mid-night) which I take to be the same with what we now call *Preaching,* (or very like it;) 'twas a long continued discourse to a Congregation met together on a Religious account for the Service of God. But let it be called (if he please) a *Religious Discourse* of the Holy Apostle to a Congregation of Christians met together for such a purpose.

He would then have it thought a favour or condescension to admit this *breaking of bread,* to be meant of the *Lords Supper;* and not barely a *Common eating.* But since he doth not deny it, we will accept the favour and take it so to be; *συνεστῆσαν ἅμυντες ἵνα φάγωμεν ἅγαν,* *The Disciples being congregated or assembled to break Bread.* 'Tis *ἅμυντες,* *The Disciples;* (not *ἑνὶν* some of them;) and they were (perhaps not every one but the generality of them, as at other meetings) *συνεστῆσαν* congregated or assembled; and it seems to be a good full Congregation, by *Eutychus's* being mounted to the

third

third loft (whatever he meant by that *third loft*, though but the *third scaffold*), so high that by a *fall* from thence he was in great danger of being killed. Now it is not likely that such a Congregation of Christians were thus assembled for common eating.

He says, *Paul* was to go away on the *Morrow*. True; But it is not said they came together to take leave of *Paul*; but, came together to Break Bread. *Paul's* going away on the *Morrow*, might be the reason (and I believe was) why they continued there so long: but the *End* for which they came together, was to Break Bread: and the occasion of their so coming, because it was the first day of the Week: On which, it should seem, they were wont to do for that end. And if he candidly consider it, methinks it should seem so to him. *Paul* came to them at *Troas* in five days, where he abode seven days: And on the first day of the Week, when the Disciples came together to break Bread, *Paul* preached to them. Doth not the fair prospect of the place import thus much, that they were then met to break Bread, as being the first day of the week? What other occasion was there of mentioning what day of the Week it was? It had been otherwise a fairer transition to have said, He staid there Seven days, and on the Seventh day, (or the last of those Seven) the Disciples came together to take leave of *Paul* and Sup with him over night, who was to depart on the morrow. Now if it had been said on the Seventh day (though meaning but the last of those Seven) it would no doubt have been urged as a great argument of *Paul's* keeping a Seventh day Sabbath, and the Disciples with him; not as a Jewish but as a Christian Assembly; for breaking of bread (which was a Christian not a Jewish Service;) For then, breaking of bread, would certainly have been the Lords Supper: (But because it was on the first day of the Week) it must now be but common eating, to take leave of *Paul*, and to Sup with him; as (he tells us p. 57.) Friends commonly do (when a Minister or any other special Acquaintance intends to take a Journey in the morning) to sup with him over night. But if he thinks this to be all which is there meant by the Disciples coming together on the first day of the Week to Break Bread; he must excuse me if I cannot be of his Opinion.

But because he is content to admit (upon some terms) their meeting might be upon a Religious account, for the Lords Supper (as no doubt it was) I shall press him no further therein: but accept of his condescension.

When he tells us, that *uia* is Greek for one, and therefore *uia sabbatou* may as well be rendred One day of the Week, as the First

First day of the Week: Surely he is not in earnest. Such trifling doth more hurt than help his cause. No doubt, but, when ever they met, it was one day of the Week, we need not be told it; nor need the word *Week* be added, he might as well have said one day; nor need he have said so much. But this Author cannot think (nor doth he) that *uia sabbatou* doth any where signify other than the first day of the Week. In the whole story of Christs Resurrection, and what followed on that day in all the Four Evangelists, we have no other word for it but *uia sabbatou*, nor have we any other word for it (that I know of) there or any where else. I do not know that it is any where called *epithymia sabbatou*. (Save that what is called *uia sabbatou* Mat. 16. 2. is *epithymia sabbatou* v. 9. which doth explain the other also.) Such shifting doth not look well.

'Tis somewhat like the Story of a man who bought a Horse for Five pounds to be paid the next day. And accordingly on the next day he sent Five Pounds of Candles. Perhaps (in the Bargain) it was not said expressly (in words at length) Five Pounds of Lawful Money of England. But, by common intendment, it must be so understood. (And an honest English Jury, upon a Tryal, would so Find it.)

The Latin word *Pridie*, is a Derivative (or Compound rather) from *præ*, prior; and *Postridie* from *post*, posterior; and accordingly (in Latin) *pridie Calendarum*, and *postridie Calendarum* must signify a day before, and a day after the Calends. But can any man think it is meant of any day? No, but the next day before, and the next day after.

So if we say, Christ was Crucified one day before the Sabbath, and Rose again one day after the Sabbath. This one day is the next day. And to any man who hath not a mind to Cavil, will understand it. And to *uia sabbatou*, one day after the Sabbath, must needs be understood of the next day after the Sabbath; Nor is it ever used in any other sense. If it were to be understood of any indefinitely, it should be *uia*; some day after the Sabbath, not *uia* one day after.

But the most pleasant shift of all, is, when he would have us think that this Evening (which is called the first day of the Week) was the Evening after the Seventh day; that is Saturday night; and the next morning (when *Paul* was to go away) was Sunday morning (and he to travel that Sunday:) And that the Evening of Saturday was the beginning of Sunday, and was therefore called the First day of the Week. Because it is said Gen. 1. the Evening and the Morning was the first day (and so of the rest) and

and therefore *the evening was the beginning of every day.* See what shift a man will make, rather than quit an Opinion he hath once taken up.

We are taught that on *the Fourteenth day of the first month at even* the Pass-over was to be killed. Doth he think that this *Fourteenth day at even* was the *end of the Thirteenth day*, the *Fourteenth day then beginning*? I think every body else takes it to be the evening at the end of the Fourteenth day, and the Fifteenth day (on the morrow) was the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. For though it were the *fourteenth day at evening*, yet it was the *fourteenth day*, not the *fifteenth*.

And *Luke 23. 54.* the evening after our Saviours Crucifixion, on the sixth day, when it was *late at night* (as was shewed before and must be, according to the story of what had been done before that time) was yet but *the preparation*, not the Sabbath, the *Seventh day* being not yet begun. For so we have it, *it was the preparation; and the Sabbath drew on.* And the Women were then *preparing their Spices and Ointments*, yet *rested the Sabbath day according to the Commandment*; so that the Sabbath day was not yet begun. Nor was it ended when the evening of the next day began, but on the morning of the day following, as was shewed above.

And (as we shewed at large before) the *first day of the Week* (on which Christ rose) began *very early in the morning while it was dark*, and continued (the *same day*) till *very late at night*. And this is the constant Language of the New Testament every where.

So that when the Congregation of Christians, *Acts 20. 7.* did on *the first day of the week* assemble to break Bread, and Paul Preached to them, continuing their Sermon till Mid-night; this must needs be on what we call *Sunday*; and the morning following was *Monday morning*; not *Sunday morning* as this Author would have it. 'Tis manifest therefore, that there was a *Religious Assembly*, of the Christian Congregation at Troas, on the *First day of the Week*, for celebration of the *Lords Supper*, and *Preaching*; and Paul with them. Which I take to be the celebration of a Christian Sabbath.

However, this (he says) is but *One Instance*. True, this is but one. (But we have heard of more before, and shall hear of more by and by.) But *this one* is more than he can shew for more than *Two Thousand Five Hundred Years* (from God's resting on the Seventh day *Gen. 2. 3.* till after *Israel* was come out of *Egypt* *Ex. 16.* during which time he would have us think the Seventh day

day Sabbath was constantly observed. And if he could shew any *one* such instance (of *Enoch*, *Noah*, *Abraham*, or others,) where such a *Religious Assembly*, for the Worship of God, was held on *the seventh day in course from the Creation*; he would think his point well proved, though no more were said of it than is of this.

Whereas now as to the time from thence to the Flood, he brings no other proof, but that *Abel*, and *Enoch*, and *Noah* were good men (as no doubt they were) and therefore it is to be presumed *they kept a Sabbath*; and that upon the *seventh day*. Which is to beg the question, not to prove it.

From thence till *Israel* going into *Egypt*, all that he brings to prove this matter of fact is but that of *Gen. 13. 6.* where (speaking of *Abram* and *Lot*, with the multitude of their Cattel) it is said, *the land was not able to bear them that they might Dwell together*; for *their substance was great so that they could not Dwell together*; and there was a *strife between the Herd-men of Abrams Cattle, and the Herd-men of Lots Cattle, &c.* They could not Dwell together, that is (saith he) they could not *Rest* together; that is, they could not keep a Sabbath together; therefore (he concludes) they did *use* to keep a Sabbath; and that Sabbath was *the seventh day in course from the Creation*. And is not this a goodly proof? I should think (if he would put a stress on the word *Rest*) it should rather signify, they could not *live quietly* together without their *herd-mens quarrelling* about their Pasture; for so it follows in the next words, *there was a strife between their herd-mens*.

From thence till after their coming out of *Egypt*, he brings no other proof but that of *Ex. 5. 4, 5.* Where, when *Moses* and *Aaron* had been pressing *Pharaoh* to let *Israel* go *three days Journey into the Wilderness*, to keep a Feast and Sacrifice to the Lord their God; *Pharaoh* replies, *Wherefore do ye Let (or hinder) the People from their Work: you make them Rest from their Burdens, or you take them off from their Work*; that is, says he, *you make them keep a Sabbath*. For the Word or Verb there Translated *you make them Rest* is, (he tells us) a derivative from another Verb which signifies *to Rest*, from which Verb the word Sabbath is also derived: They did therefore *Rest* (saith he) that is *keep a Sabbath*, and that Sabbath was *every Week*, and it was on *the seventh day in course from the Creation*.

Alas! how little do either or both of these places prove, of what he would have to be granted him thence! He tells us sometimes there were other *Sabbaths*, besides that of the *seventh day*; I am sure there were other *Restings*. E If

If *Moses and Aaron* had desired *Pharaoh* to excuse them from their Work *one day in seven*, that on such day they might serve the Lord their God; it would have looked like an Argument. But when it is, *to go three days into the Wilderness to keep a Feast to the Lord*; what is this to a *Weekly Sabbath*?

This *Seventh-day-sabbath*, so runs in the mind of this Author that if any where he can lay hold of the word *Rest*, it must presently prove a *Seventh-day-sabbath*. Else who would have thought, that because *Abram* and *Lot* could not dwell quietly together; therefore they must needs keep a *Sabbath*, and that upon the *seventh* day, and in course from the *Creation*? And the like of the *Israelites in Egypt*, because *Moses* and *Aaron* are said to *binder* them from their Work; Therefore they did constantly keep a weekly *Sabbath*, and that upon the *seventh* day, in course from the *Creation*.

He might have to better purpose, alledg'd *Pharaoh's seven fat kine and seven lean ones*, and the *seven full ears of Corn*, and *seven empty*; for here we have the number *seven* signalized; only these were *Seven Years*, not *Seven Days*; and the like of *Nebuchadnezzar's* being *seven years* turned out to the *Beasts of the field*, Dan. 4. 25, 32, 33. Or that of the *Clean Beasts and Fowls* coming into the Ark by *sevens*, Gen. 7. 2, 3.

But, what is more to his purpose (and which he should not have missed) is that of Gen. 7. 4. and Gen. 8. 10, 12. where we have the interval of *seven days* particularly mentioned; *For yet seven days, and I will cause it to rain upon the Earth*, &c. (Chap. 7. 4.) where God gives to *Noah* just a *Weeks* warning of the time when the Flood should begin, during which interval (if those days were Sabbath days) he might remove himself and what was necessary into the Ark before the next Sabbath. And, toward the end of the Flood, *Noah* sends out the *Dove*, Chap. 8. 8. *And he staid seven days, and again sent forth the Dove*, ver. 10. *And he staid yet other seven days, and sent forth the Dove*, &c. ver. 12. Where we have the *Dove* sent out three times, just at *seven days* distance. And how do we know but that these *three days* were three *Sabbath days*? Which though it be not a conclusive Argument, is better than any that he brings. For here we have three *Intervals of seven days*, in these two Chapters.

But if a *Weekly Sabbath* were then kept, 'tis very strange that we should have no intimation of any such thing in the books of *Moses* (before *Israel's* coming out of *Egypt*.) And much more, that there is nothing of it in the Book of *Job*. And, that none of

of his friends (amongst the many charges they bring against him) should never object his *Neglect of the Sabbath*, or want of *due observance* thereof. Which being so plausible an objection, it seems more likely, that a Sabbath was not then wont to be observed: for which he hath so very little to shew. And by what we have Job 1. 4. It should seem that *Job's Seven Sons* kept *Feasting* (each in his own day) for *Seven days together*; without any mention of a Sabbath intervening. Nor was it a *Religious Feast*, but a Feast of mirth and jollity, such as made *Job* suspicious lest they might sin and curse God in their hearts, v. 5. And therefore he offer'd propitiatory *Sacrifices for them continually*, or (as the Margin tells us it is in the Hebrew) *all the days*; that is every of these *Seven days*.

As little a matter will serve his turn to prove (p. 43.) that *Christ's Ascension* was, and his coming to Judgment is to be, on a *Saturday*, or *Seventh-day-Sabbath*: Because it is said Acts 1. 12. that *Mount Olivet* (whence he ascended) is, from *Jerusalem*, a *Sabbath-days Journey*.

But he tells us that *by no account that he can make, can he assign the Ascension on the First day*, (No more can I.) But what then?

Well! But why upon a *Saturday* rather than a *Sunday*? Because he observes, that after *Christ's Ascension* from *Mount Olivet*, it is said, *Then they returned to Jerusalem from Mount Olivet, which is from Jerusalem a Sabbath-days Journey*. Well! what of this? *He cannot see why it was expressly said, that it was but a Sabbath-days Journey from Jerusalem, but because it was the Sabbath-day*.

Perhaps I may shew him another reason as likely as it. If the word *then* do not there signify *the same day* (but only at large, after his *Ascension*) this is nothing to the purpose. But admitting that by *then* he meant *the same day*; the connexion runs fairly thus, *After his Ascension they returned from thence to Jerusalem the same day, for it was (say, so) but a little way off, about a Sabbath-days Journey*. Which, I think, is a fair account of the place; Especially since we know otherwise, that it was not upon a Sabbath day.

Again, if this (of a *Sabbath-days Journey*) should intimate, it was on a Sabbath day; why on a *Seventh* day, rather than a *First* day? and why upon no account upon the *First*? For, if the *First* day were then a Sabbath (as we think it was) that of *not traveling more than a Sabbath-days Journey*, would as well respect a *First-days Sabbath*, as a *Seventh-days Sabbath*. So that he is not at all advanced hereby to his *Seventh day Sabbath*; The same

Account (as he speaks) will serve as well for the one as for the other. But, indeed, for neither.

But how doth this concern his *Coming to Judgment*? Yes, Because it is there said (ver. 11.) *He shall come in like manner (or return) as ye have seen him go into Heaven.* And (because this Author fancies) he did *Ascend* on a Sabbath day, therefore (he fancies also) he shall on a Sabbath day *come again*. I see a *Weak Argument*, with a *strong Fancy* will go far.

But to prove his *Ascension* to be on the Sabbath (besides this, of a Sabbath-days Journey) he adds further, That *Christ and his Disciples were then Assembled* and that *Christ Preached*. Well! And why may we not as well conclude that the day of his *Resurrection* was also a Sabbath? For *Christ and his Disciples were then Assembled*, (first at *Emmaus*, and then at *Jerusalem*;) and *Christ did then also* (at both places) *Preach to them*, and the substance of his *Preaching* was much the same, (as will appear by comparing *Luk. 24.* with *Acts 1.*) and did then also *Celebrate the Lords Supper*. And *eight days after*, *Christ was again Assembled* with the *Disciples*, and *Preached to them*, on the same day of the Week. If *Christ's Presence and Preaching* will prove the *Ascension* day to be a Sabbath, why should it not as well prove the *Resurrection* day to be a Sabbath? the only difference is, That (he thinks) serves his turn, But this makes against him.

And why should it not also be thought a Sabbath, *Acts 20.* For *Paul and the Disciples were then Assembled*; and they were assembled to *break Bread*; and *Paul there Preached to them*. And all these Assemblies were on the *first day of the Week*. And they seem to me a much stronger proof of the *First* day (the day of his *Resurrection*) being a Sabbath, than that the *Ascension* day was so.

And the *Preaching* which our Author here mentions as on the day of *Ascension*, seems to me rather to have been on that of the *Resurrection*. For *St. Luke* in the beginning of this Chapter of *Acts 1.* seems to give a short repetition of what himself had delivered more at large *Luk. 24.* And gives an account not only of what happened on the day of *Ascension*, (though he close with it) but of what happened during the *forty days* from his *Resurrection* to that time. And this *Preaching*, I take to be that mentioned *Luke 24.* on the day of his *Resurrection*.

But (after all) this is but a Whimsy, (what he tells us of *Christ's Ascension* on a Seventh-day Sabbath.) For 'tis very plain that his *Ascension* was neither on a *seventh* day, nor on a *first*, but on a *fifth* day of the Week. For 'tis plainly said, *Acts 1. 3.*

That

That he shewed himself alive after his *Passion*, being seen of them *Forty days*, (that is, he was seen of them at times, not constantly, for the space of *Forty* days) whereof that of his *Resurrection* was the first, and that of his *Ascension* was the last. And if that were *Sunday*, this must be *Thursday*. He may tell it upon his fingers (as he speaks *p. 5.*) if he please.

But though our Saviours *Ascension* was not on the *seventh* day of the Week (in observance of the Seventh-day Sabbath, or in confirmation thereof:) Yet the mission of the *Holy Ghost* (according as on the *First* day of the Week, the day of his *Resurrection*, he had promised. *Luk. 24. 49.*) was on the *first* day of the Week fulfilled also, as appears *Acts 2.* When the day of *Pentecost* was fully come, that is, the *Fiftieth* day (for so *Pentecost* signifieth in Greek) they were all with one accord in one place (that is, they were unanimously assembled) and suddenly there came a sound from Heaven, as of a rushing mighty Wind, and filled the house, where they were sitting; And there appeared to them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them (that is, at least, upon each of the Apostles,) and they were all filled with the *Holy Ghost*, and began to speak with other Tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance. Which I take to be a further instance, (if our Author will not allow it to be called a Sabbath,) at least of a Religious Assembly for the Worship of God; (And if it had been on the *seventh* day, how great a proof would this have been with him for a Seventh-day Sabbath.) This I take to be a *Christian Sabbath*, and within the prospect of the *Fourth Commandment*. And though it be not expressly called a Sabbath (to avoid confusion or ambiguity, because the word *Sabbath* in common speech was then appropriated to the Jewish Sabbath,) yet it is the same thing.

And if he doubt whether the Feast of *Pentecost* were on the *First* day of the Week, as was that of the *Resurrection*; he may be satisfied from *Levit. 23. 15.* where that Feast is appointed. After mention made of the *Pass-over*, (ver. 5. &c.) *Moses* proceeds to that of the *Wave-offering*, v. 10, 11. When ye be come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof; then shall ye bring a sheaf of the first-fruits of your harvest unto the Priest, and he shall Wave the sheaf before the Lord to be accepted for you; on the morrow after the Sabbath the Priest shall wave it.

Whether by the Sabbath here mentioned be meant the *Weekly Sabbath*, or the *first* day of the Feast of *Unleavened Bread*, is not material; because, in that year whereof we are speaking, this *first* day of the Feast was on the *Weekly Sabbath*, (as is manifest from

from the story of Christs Crucifixion, which was on the Sixth day of the Week, and the next day (being the Seventh day) was the Feast of the Pass-over; and the morrow after this Sabbath, was the day of Christs Resurrection, as well of the Wave-offering. And then he proceeds, ver. 15, 16, to the Feast of Pentecost, or the Feast of Weeks. *Ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the Sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the Wave-offering, seven Sabbaths shall be compleat, even unto the morrow after the seventh Sabbath, shall ye number Fifty days* (inclusively taken, as the manner is in Scripture reckoning, and must needs be so here.) It was called the Feast of Pentecost, or the Feast of Weeks (as Deut. 16. 9, 10.) which Feast of Pentecost was the morrow after the Sabbath, on a first day of the Week.

And on this first day of the Week, (the morrow after the seventh day Sabbath) here was a solemn Assembly for Religious Worship, and a very large one, both of Jews and Gentiles out of every nation under Heaven, Parthians, Medes, Elamites, &c. And this solemnized by a Miraculous Effusion of the Holy Ghost, in the gift of Tongues: For we all hear (say those of that great Assembly) every one in our own Tongue wherein we were born the wonderful Works of God, ver. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. With a long Sermon of Peter's on that occasion. Which I take to be another celebration of the First-day Sabbath; and a very eminent one.

We are to observe also, that in some of the places alleged to this purpose, though but single instances, there is an intimation of a frequent usage. As in that Act. 20. 7. *On the first day of the week, the disciples being assembled to break bread, Paul preached, &c.* Is a fair intimation, that on the first day they did use so to assemble.

If it were said amongst us, *About six a clock, when they were come together (in the College-Hall) to supper, such a thing happened: Any (unprejudiced) person would take it for a fair intimation, that they used to sup about six a clock.* And if this Author could any where find, in the book of Job, that *On the seventh day of the week* (from the Creation) when Job and his friends were assembled for the joint service of God, Bildad spake thus, &c. He would take this for a strong proof, that the seventh-day Sabbath was then wont to be observed. Much stronger than what he allegeth to that purpose, *Abram and Lot had each of them so many Cattel, that they could not dwell (or rest) together, without quarrellings amongst their servants.* And that of what Pharaoh said to Moses and Aaron, *Why do you hinder their work, you make the people Rest from their burthens?*

A like place is that of 1 Cor. 16. 1, 2. *Now concerning the Collection*

lection for the Saints, as I have given order to the Churches of Galatia, even so do ye: (and what that was, we are told in the next words,) Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come. (If it had been so said to Noah, to Abraham, or to Job, Upon the seventh day of the week do thus or thus; what a strong proof would this have been for the Observation of a seventh day Sabbath!)

I think it is plain from hence, that the First day of the week, was weekly observed; and was wont to be observed, both by the Church of Corinth, and by the Churches of Galatia. For St. Paul doth not here advise it, but suppose it, or take it for granted.

What that order was to the Churches of Galatia our Author says he cannot tell. I thought it had been plain enough: he bids the Corinthians do, as he bid the Galatians; that is, on the First day of the Week, &c. What further order, he had given the Galatians, it is not as to this point necessary for us to know.

But saith he, if they must on that day lay by as God hath blessed them, then they must on that day cast up their accounts, tell their money, reckon their stock, compute their expenses, &c. which are not Sabbath-day Works. A wise objection? As though all this could not as well be done before (so far as is necessary) and, on Sunday, put so much into the poor mans box (or give to the Deacons or Collectors) as (upon such account) they should have found it; like as is now done in our Churches when there is occasion for such Collections.

Why doth he not make the same exception to that of Deut. 16. 10. concerning the Feast of Pentecost? where they are to bring a tribute of a free-will-offering, which (says he) thou shalt give unto the Lord thy God, &c. according as the Lord thy God hath blessed thee; Doth he think that on the day of Pentecost (which was to be strictly observed as a Sabbath, a holy Convocation and no servile work to be done, Lev. 23, 31.) they must cast up their accounts, tell their money, &c. because they were to offer according as the Lord hath blessed them? I think not.

But here comes in again his former trifling objection of *the first day of the Week*. Yet I am very confident, himself doth really believe it doth here so signify, and (as to his own thoughts) doth not doubt of it. But perhaps thinks it a piece of wit, or skill in Greek, thus to object against his own judgment. Yet since he will have it so, (and we must come again to Childs play,) I will say somewhat to it.

Whether

Whether *μία σαββατων* be good Greek or no, as to the common analogy of that Tongue; or, what is the reason of that Syntax; I need not trouble my self to enquire, (because it is nothing to the purpose; for we are not inquiring whether it be good Greek, but what it here signifies.) There are I presume in all Languages (by negligence or corruption) some harsh expressions, as to the analogy of the Language, which yet are allowable by common usage, and well enough understood.

He would think it perhaps a little harsh to say in Greek *τρεσκαίδέκα*, *παραδεκά* (that is in Latine, *tres & decimum*, *quatuor & decimum*,) for what we say in English *thirteenth*, *fourteenth*; yet so they speak. And somewhat harsh *δεννὸν δώδεκα αὐτῷ* *Rev. 2. 26.* *Rev. 3. 21.* and *δεννὸν πρὸς αὐτὸν*, *Rev. 3. 12.* (instead of *τὸν δώδεκα*, *τὸν πρὸς αὐτὸν*) yet so it is. And *ἐν τῷ ὄντι* *Rev. 1. 4.* And many such may be shewed.

In Latine, *idcirco*, *quocirca*, *posthac*, *quapropter*, *controvertor*, *paterfamilias*, *omne genus homines*, *Aethiops albus dentes*, *pridie calendas*, and many more, are scarce to be accounted for as regular, save that they are so used; but, because they are so used, they are accounted elegant enough.

In English; *Methinks* (for *I think*) *three pound ten shillings*, (for *three pounds*, &c.) *three foot nine inches*, *many a one*, *a few Pottage*, and the like, are scarce regular; yet are so used. When a Merchant marks his Parcels (and so calls them) *number one*, *number two*, &c. he means *first* and *second*. So, in the Year of our Lord *one thousand six hundred and ninety one*, *One thousand six hundred ninety two*, is commonly said; when yet we mean *ninety first*, *ninety second*; so *one a clock*, *two a clock*, for the *first* and *second* hour after Twelve. And other the like cases, where the Cardinal number is put for the Ordinal. As it is also in *Gen. 1. The evening, and morning were (jorn ecbad) day one*; which the Septuagint renders *ἡμέρα μία*, and *μία* doth there signify *ἡμέρα*. Yet no wise man will cavil as to the sense of such expressions, (what ever they may do as to the Grammatical construction,) when we know what is meant by them.

So here, 'tis true *μία* doth properly signify *one* in common construction: but *μία σαββατων* doth never signify other than *the first day of the week*, (either in the New Testament or any where else,) not *any day of the week*, any more than *one a clock* doth signify any other hour than the *first* after *twelve*. When a thing is said to be done at *one a clock*; he that shall object, this may be *any hour*, for every

every hour is *one*; would be laugh'd at. And when a Merchant bids his Prentice bring him *number one*, if he bring him what else he pleases (because every number, is *number one*, or *one number*) he deserveth to be knockt.

Now when every one knows (who understands any thing of this nature,) that *μία σαββατων* is the proper name of that day which is next after the Jewish Sabbath, as much as *one a clock* is the proper name of that hour which is next after Twelve: it must either be great ignorance, or somewhat worse so to object. I appeal to himself, whether ever he met with that name (in any Author) in any other sense.

He seems to take it very unkindly, pag. 66 of those who should think that, by *son of man* should be meant an ordinary Man, in *Mar. 2. 27, 28.* *The Sabbath was made for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath; therefore the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath.* Where I think it is plain, that in the former verse (*the Sabbath was made for Man*, &c.) it is manifestly spoken of ordinary Men. And though in the latter verse, (*the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath*), by *Son of Man* I suppose is meant Christ; yet is that Title given also to ordinary Men, elsewhere, very often. As *Job. 25. 6.* *How much less Man who is a Worm, and the Son of Man who is a Worm?* And *Isai. 51. 12.* *Who art thou that shouldst be afraid of a Man that shall die, and of the Son of Man which shall be made as Grass.* So *Pf. 8. 4.* *What is Man, that thou art mindful of him, and the Son of Man that thou visitest him?* And to the same purpose, *Pf. 144. 3.* And (to name no more) in the Book of *Ezekiel*, the Prophet *Ezekiel* is, in that one Book, called *Son of Man*, oftner than Christ is so called in the whole Bible. And if we would argue as he doth, we might plausibly object, It might be so meant here, though I think it is not. But he cannot shew that ever the Jewish Sabbath was called *the Lords day* (however he thinks it might have been;) nor (though *μία* be Greek for *One*) that *μία σαββατων* is ever used for other than the *first day of the week*, or the *next* after the Jewish Sabbath. Nor doth he think it. Such trifling (to give it no harder name) may do well enough in Drollery or Burlesque, but not in a plain honest Enquiry.

But if he would be curious as to the Phrase; 'tis plain enough that *σαββατων* is not properly the Genitive case governed of *μία*. For then it should have been *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*, because *μία* is of the Neuter Gender. (And 'tis a mistake therefore when p. 58. he renders it by *One of the Sabbaths*, as if it had been *ἐν σαββατων*.) But 'tis governed rather of some Preposition or Particle understood, (as *ἐν* or the like,) and then, as in Latin *pridie calendas* (that is,

prior dies ante calendas) is the next day before the Calends: so is *μία οὐββатар* (or *μία ἀντὶ οὐββатар*) the next day after the Sabbath: The full construction is *μία ἡμέρα ἀντὶ οὐββатар*, (the word *ἡμέρα* being understood in the word *μία*, and *ἀντὶ* understood in the word *οὐββатар*.) That is *one day after the Sabbath*, which being the proper Name of a day, cannot be meant of any other but the Next day after.

'Tis certain therefore that (*μία οὐββатар*) the first day of the Week, or the first day after the Jewish Sabbath, was from the Resurrection of Christ and after, eminently signalized as a day of special Observation; 'Twas honoured with Christs Resurrection on that day; with his first appearance to Mary Magdalen and the other Women; then, to the Two Disciples going to Emmaus, and his Religious Assembly with them there; after that, to the Disciples at Jerusalem and assembling with them the same day; and the whole time of those Assemblings employed in Religious Exercises, (Preaching, Celebrating the Lords Supper, Instructing and Blessing his Disciples, and giving them Commission for Preaching the Gospel and Planting the Christian Church.) And again with the same Disciples on that day *seven night*, assembled with them, and in like manner employed. It was specially signalized also by the Miraculous Effusion of the Holy Ghost on that day, in a great assembly of Jews and Gentiles on the day of Pentecost; and the day employed in Preaching and other Religious exercises. It was observed in like manner at Troas, in preaching the Word, Celebrating the Lords Supper, and other Religious Communion, as things there usual on that day. It was observed at Corinth, not once onely, but as a thing of course; and so presumed by the Apostle when he gives particular Instructions concerning a Collection for the Saints to be made weekly on that day. And in like manner in the Churches of Galatia, with a like direction to them. (And we have no reason to suspect but that in other Churches also, there was a like custome of observing that day.) And it is the onely day of the week (unless the Seventh-day, in order to the Jewish Sabbath) that is so much as Mentioned by name after the Resurrection of Christ. (At least I do not at present remember the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, or Sixth day of the week by name so mentioned.) Now what we have reason to believe was so generally observed after the Resurrection, by Christ himself (more than once,) by his Apostles, and by the Christian Churches in their days; we have reason to believe was according to Christs direction. For we know very well, that Christ

Christ did after his resurrection give commandments to the Apostles, about things pertaining unto the kingdom of God, and settling the Christian Church. What those Commandments were in particular, we cannot tell; but are to presume that what they did therein, was pursuant of those commands; and this in particular about observing the first day of the week, which we call the Christian Sabbath; and which (in contradistinction to the Jewish Sabbath) is called the Lords day; Rev. i. 10. And hath accordingly been so called, and so observed ever since. Which being so practised by the Apostles, and so continued ever since, I take to be a good warrant for us to continue it, as a thing agreeable to the Will of God.

As to what he so often objects, that there is no express command thereof recorded: that is, not such a command as our Author demands. We are not to prescribe to God in what terms he shall make known his Will, (any more than the Pharisees, Mat. 16. 4. were to prescribe to Christ what kind of signs he was to shew to testify his authority;) 'tis sufficient if God do in his own way intimate what is his Will, though it be not with the formality of *Be it Enacted*. And those who are willing to be taught of God, will be content so to understand his meaning. An approved Practice in the Worship of God, frequently Repeated, attested by Miracles, encouraged by Christs own Example, and that of the Apostles and the Christian Churches then, and continued in the Christian Church ever since: Is to me great evidence of the will of God; and that there was a command for it, though it be not recorded. (Like as I believe that there was, very early, a command from God, to worship him by Sacrifice, though that command be not recorded.)

But (to that of its being so observed ever since) he objects, we have nothing but Tradition, either that the Christian Sabbath hath been so observed, or that it is called the Lords-day. And Tradition is what he takes great pleasure to exclaim against; If that be admitted (saith he) where shall we stop?

Very well! I am not over fond of laying too great a weight upon Traditions; at least not on all things that are pretended so to be. But, I pray, How can he tell, otherwise than by Tradition, whether our Saturday or our Sunday, be the Seventh day in course from the Creation? Or, (if that be too hard a question) whether of the two is the Seventh day of the Jewish week, I know nothing but Tradition for it. I cannot remember so long: Nor have I so long kept so strict account of days as to be sure of it. I trust to the common Computation of the world, that our Sab-

bath is a continuation of that Sabbath which the Apostles kept. And if so, I am safe. If not, I cannot help it. And because I think the Apostles Sabbath was on the first day of the Jewish week, therefore I think ours to be so. But if theirs was not, neither is ours.

He would not have that of St. John, Revel. 1. 10. *I was in the spirit on the Lords day* to be understood of our Sabbath. And why not? He tells us, 1. Some think it to be *Christmas day*; 2. Some think it to be *Easter day*; and 3. Some think it to be the *Day of Judgment*. And long Discourses we have upon all these. Well! But doth he think it to be meant of any of these? No. Then, to what purpose are these alleged, in disparagement of the Christian Sabbath?

But he seems to have so great displeasure against the *Christian Sabbath*, that whatever he can think of to be Objected (though he do not think it to be true) he will be sure to Object, (that he may disparage the day, or perplex the Argument) as if he were more concerned to beat down the *Christian Sabbath*, than to set up the *Jewish*. Not considering, that, by all this, he is doing their Work who would have none at all. For they know well that the *Jewish Sabbath* hath been long since laid aside (without any great fear of returning;) and if they can but throw off the *Christian Sabbath* also, 'tis what they would have. And 'tis of a like import what he argues (p. 84.) for coming to the publick but once a day, (not twice as our manner is;) For those who care not to come at all, if he dispence with them as to the One, they will dispence with themselves as to the Other meeting.

I should rather think, that, the whole day being due to the Service of God (publick and private) it is to be parcelled out, as to the number and times of publick meeting; as might (according to Christian Prudence) be judged most conducing (in this or that place) to those ends, and to common Edification; and that, to make such little Circumstances (otherwise than as they conduce to those general ends) a matter of *Religious Observation*, or *Divine Institution*, is a like extravagance as that of the Pharisees in laying like weight on their Traditions, and that of the Papists on their numerous Superstitious Ceremonies. And is as properly *superstition*, as these.

I do not know this Author, (who thus argues against observing the Christian Sabbath, and against publick meeting on that day more than once;) And therefore am not willing to judge hardly. But the natural result of what he argues, is as I told you.

He

He doth not think that John, was (on the *Lords day* Revel. 1. 10.) keeping the Anniversary of Christs Incarnation; nor of his Resurrection. (No more do I.) But why not? Because (saith he) *he may say as in the case of Moses's dead body, No man knows of his Sepulchre to this day.* Now as to the Incarnation, I am apt to think, that no man doth At this day know certainly, either on what day of the Year, or what day of the Week Christ was born (nor is it any matter whether we do or no.) But I should rather say, no man knows At this day, than (as he) no man knoweth To this day, (as if no man hitherto had known it;) for certainly there have been those who knew it heretofore (while he was alive) though it be now forgotten, and at this day no man knows it. But will he say so as to the Resurrection? I think it is plain, that Christ was Crucified on the fourteenth day, lay in the Grave the fifteenth, and rose again the sixteenth day, of the first month. And that he rose on the first day of the week, no man doubts. He should rather have put it thus, *As no man knows To this day, where is the Body of Moses*, (that it might not be worshiped,) *So no man knows At this day, which is the Seventh in course from the Creation*; that we might not contend about it.

However, I am contented to admit, (if that will please him) that the *Lords day* there mention'd was neither meant of *Christmas day*, nor *Easter day*, nor *Whit-sunday*, nor the day of Judgment; but think it to be meant of the first day of the week, which is the *Christian Sabbath*. Not, of any of those other days mentioned; nor of the *Jewish Sabbath*, as he would have it.

'Tis, I think, a new notion of his own (at least I know none other of his mind) that it should be meant of the *Jewish Sabbath*. He grants there is nothing from the Circumstances of the place to determine it to this day. Nor doth he pretend to shew that the *Jewish Sabbath* was ever so called. But he thinks it might have been so called. For he says *God blessed and sanctified the seventh day* (that is, the Seventh day after Six days of Labour) therefore it might have been called the *Lords day*; and so may as well the *Christian Sabbath* as the *Jews Sabbath*. That the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath day; And so is he of every day in the Week; and of the *Christian Sabbath* (when that is the Sabbath) as well as of the *Jewish*. That the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord our God; that is, the Seventh day after Six days of Labour; but whether the Seventh day in course from the Creation, is no where said. That *Mat. 5. 17.* The Sabbath is called my holy

holy day: True, on what ever day the Sabbath be: First or Seventh of the Week; or whatever day God appoints to be kept *Holy*; As for instance, *the first and seventh day of the Feast of Unleavened bread*, Ex. 12. 16. The *First* day shall be a *Holy Convocation*; and the *Seventh* day shall be a *Holy Convocation*; and each of them was *the Lords Holy day*, on what ever day of the week they happened. And the like for other days. So *Levit. 23. 2, 4, 8, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32, 35, 36, 39.* and *Num. 28. 18, 25, 26. Num. 29. 1, 7, 12, 35.* All the days here mentioned are *the Lords Holy days*, yet I do not take any of them to be *the Lords day*. And all he can pretend to from these or whatever he produceth, is no more but that the *Jewish Sabbath* (while it was the Sabbath) might have been so called, *and the Lords day*; he doth not pretend to shew that ever it was so called.

Now I would desire this Gentleman (if he can but a little while lay aside his prejudice) to consider, first that *the Lords day* was the proper name of a day; whereby it might be known as distinguished from other days; (else to what purpose is it said *I was in the spirit on the Lords day*;) whereas the proper name of the *Jewish Sabbath* (and of that onely as he would have us think p. 64.) was the *Sabbath day*; and there is no appearance of reason, why, if he meant that day, he should not rather have said *I was in the spirit on the Sabbath day, or the seventh day.* This therefore must needs be meant of some other day, known by an other name.

2. I would have him next consider, the *the Lord* in the Old Testament is the usual name of *God* indefinitely; without particularizing this or that of the Three Persons; and *the Sabbath of the Lord thy God*, doth not appropriate it to the second Person more than to the first and third. And though I do not deny, that our *Lord Christ* was the *God* who gave the Ten Commandments (for all the three Persons are the same *God*;) yet I do not think it to be *Christ* onely, as contradistinguished to the other two. And when it is said, *I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other God but me*; the meaning is not, I the second Person, am so the *Lord thy God*, that thou shalt own no other Person for thy *God* beside me the second Person. But *the Lord*, in the New Testament, is for the most part applied peculiarly to our *Lord Christ* (*God and Man*;) and is understood of him. (As he is called elsewhere *the Son of Man*;) And accordingly *the Lords day* must be a day peculiarly appropriate to our *Lord Christ*; which the Jews Sabbath was not, nor that of the Fourth Commandment: which

which is the Sabbath of the *Lord thy God*, that is of *God* indefinitely; for 'tis in that notion that *God* speaks in the Ten Commandments, not as one person contradistinguished to the other two.

It is *the Lords day* in a like sense, as *the Lords Supper*, 1 Cor. 11. 20. and *the Cup of the Lord, the Table of the Lord*, 1 Cor. 10. 21, 22. 1 Cor. 11. 27. In all which, by *the Lord*, is meant the *Lord Christ*, *God and Man*. And because, there being a double Sabbath then in use, (the *Jewish Sabbath*, and the *Christian Sabbath*;) and the word *Sabbath* indefinitely having been a long time applied to the *Jewish Sabbath*, and would be apt to be understood of it; therefore (by way of distinction) that of the Christians (though a *Sabbath* also, within the sense of the Fourth Commandment) was called *the Lords day*, as being the Day or Sabbath appropriate to our *Lord Jesus Christ*. And therefore when he tells us, so often, the World was made by our *Lord Jesus Christ*; and the Law given on Mount Sinai by our *Lord Jesus Christ*, (upon which Notions he seems to lay great stress, though it be nothing to the purpose,) I think it is a mistake. For our *Lord Jesus Christ* is *God and Man*, but he was not *God and Man* when the World was made, or the Law given, but onely *God*. 'Tis true *Christ* as *God*, (according to his Divine Nature) is the same *God* who made the World, and gave the Law, (for we have no other *God* but one) but not as *God and Man*. For *Man* he was not at that time, but in the fullness of time became *Man*. The Sabbath of the *Lord our God* (in the Fourth Commandment, with equal respect to all the Three Persons) doth not signify the same as, The Sabbath of our *Lord Jesus Christ* (*God and Man*.) The *Lord our God* there, not the same with our *Lord Jesus Christ*, in the New Testament. But *the Lords Supper* is the *Supper of the Lord Jesus Christ* (*God and Man*;) the Founder of our Christian Religion: And accordingly *the Lords day* is the day of our *Lord Jesus Christ*, a day appointed by him.

3. I would have him consider further, that *the Lords day*, (*dominica*, or *dies dominicus*;) hath been all along in all ages of the Christian Church, used as the proper name of what we otherwise call the *Christian Sabbath*; and not for the proper name of any other day; and therefore, till somewhat do appear to the contrary, I shall take it to be the same with what is called *the Lords day* in Scripture.

There is, in the New Testament, a place called *Rome*; and there at this day a place in *Italy* called *Rome*, and which hath been so called all along ever since; neither do I know of any other eminent

ment place so called. Therefore (till somewhat do appear to the contrary) I shall presume our *Rome* to be the same place with that which in the New Testament is called *Rome*.

We find in scripture there is an Island of the Mediterranean Sea called *Melita* or *Malta* (where St. Paul suffered Ship-wrack) not far from another Island called *Cretæ*. Now we know also there is in the Mediterranean Sea an Island called *Malta* at this day, and another not far from thence called *Crete* or *Candy*, and we do not know of any other Islands so called, then or at any time since; and therefore we may safely presume (till somewhat do appear to the contrary) that those Islands now so called, are the same Islands with those which were then so called.

And in like manner, that Day which hath been ever since called *the Lords-day* as by its proper name, we may and ought to presume to be the same day which was by St. John so called (as by its proper name) in *Rev. i. 10.* when he wrote the Book of the Revelation; till it can be shewed that he did by that name mean some other day.

And we have the more reason so to presume, because we find it so called by others, very soon after St. John's time; and by those whom we have great reason to believe to have been well acquainted with St. John's meaning and his manner of speech.

The first I shall name is St. Ignatius, who was not onely contemporary with St. John, but was a Disciple or Scholar of St. John. Now St. John (according to the best account we can have from Chronology) wrote his Revelation in *Patmos* (whither he was banished by *Domitian*), in or about the year of our Lord 96; (after which he wrote his Gospel, upon his return from *Patmos* to *Ephesus*;) And died in the Year 98 or 99 under *Trajanus*. And Ignatius died a Martyr under the same Emperor *Trajan*, in the Year of our Lord 107. So that there is no great distance in time. (And if we should miss a Year or two it is not material.) How long before his death Ignatius wrote his Epistle to the *Magnesian*s, we are not sure (nor is it material;) Now in that his Epistle to the *Magnesian*s; even according to the genuine Edition published by Bishop *Usher* out of an ancient Manuscript (not that which is justly suspected to be interpolated,) he doth earnestly exhort them not to Judaize, but to live as *Christians*; (*Si enim usque hunc secundum Judaismum vivimus; confitemur gratiam non recepisse.*) And as to the Sabbath in particular, *Non amplius Sabbatizantes, sed secundum Dominicam viventes, in qua & vita nostra ortu est.*) Not any longer observing the Jewish Sabbath, but the *Lords*

Day

Day on which Christ our Life rose again. It is manifest therefore, that within 8 or 10 years after St. John's writing, *the Lords day* did not signify the Jewish Sabbath, but the first day of the week, on which our Saviour Rose again; and that it was then observed in contradistinction to the Jewish Sabbath. I forbear to mention his Epistle ad *Trallianos* (where again we have *κυριακή* applied to the first day of the week on which Christ rose again) because it is in that Edition which is suspected to be interpolated.

I might to this add the Testimony of *Polycarp*, who was also a Disciple of St. John, and collected and published these Epistles of *Ignatius*; and may be presumed to understand what St. John meant by *the Lords day*.

But I shall add in the next place that of *Justin Martyr*; whom though I cannot call a Disciple of St. John, (because he was not converted to the Christian Religion till about the Year of our Lord 129, about Thirty years after St. John's Death,) yet he lived so soon after, that he could not be ignorant of the Christians Practice, and what they understood St. John to mean by *the Lords Day*. And how that day was observed in *Justin's* time, he tells us in (what is called) his *Second Apology*, *Τὴ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ κυριακῇ πάντων τῶν πόλεως ἡ ἀρχὴς μνημονεύει ὅτι τὸ αὐτὸ σωτήριον γένεαι, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τοῦ Ἀποστόλου, καὶ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀναγιγνώσκειν* and a little after *καὶ ὅτι ἡμεῖς, καὶ ἡ πᾶσις ἡ σωτήριον ποιούμεθα ἐπειδὴ ὁ Θεὸς ἐστὶν, ἐν ᾧ ὁ Θεὸς τὸ σὸς καὶ ὁ ἕλεος καὶ ἡ χάρις, κόσμον ἐποίησε καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοῦ, τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνίστη.* *Or that day commonly called Sunday, there is held a Congregation or a general Meeting together, of all Inhabitants whether of City or Country, and there are publicly read the Memorials or Monuments of the Apostles, or the Writings of the Prophets, &c. And again, The day called Sunday we do all in common make & συνέλευσιν the Meeting-day; for that the First-day is it on which God from Darknes and Matter made the World, and our Saviour Christ did on the same day rise from the dead. In which places though it be not called dominica, but dies solis, (because here speaking to a Heathen Emperor,) yet how it was then solemnly observed, in memory of our Lord Christs Resurrection, is evident.*

'Tis manifest therefore that *the Lords day* (*ἡμέρα κυριακή*, *Dominica*, or *Dies Dominicus*,) was the known name of a day so called when St. John wrote his Revelation; That it was a day of Religious Worship contradistinguished to that of the Jewish Sabbath, so observed and so called by (St. John's Disciple) Ignatius within 8 or 10 years at most after St. John's writing that Book; (Which he

G

would

would not have done if he had not thought it to be so meant by his Master St. John.) And in what manner it was observed (in their solemn religious assemblies) *Justin Martyr* tells us within 20 years after that; and that it was otherwise called (*ἡ ἡμέρα*) Sunday. And that *Dominica* or *Dies Dominicus*, hath been so used not onely by the Ancient Christian Writers, *Ignatius, Clemens, Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, &c.* but by the *Councils* and *Church History* all along; hath been so often shewed by divers, and is to be seen by any who please to consult them, as is not to be doubted by any; unless we would (under the notion of *Tradition*) deny all History; which in a plain matter of Fact were very unreasonable. Nor can he shew that the name of the *Lords day* ever was (however it might have been as he thinks) attributed to the *Jewish Sabbath*. And therefore to tell us that this name is *stolen* from the *Jewish Sabbath* to be applied to ours, is such a *Fansy* as may be *laughed at*, but doth not deserve a serious Answer. Sure we are that the *Christian Sabbath* hath been long in possession of that name; but, that ever the *Jewish Sabbath* was so, there is no evidence: Therefore the *Theft* must be on his side, who *steals* it from us to give it to the *Jewish Sabbath*.

But he tells us, that our Saviour himself observed the *Jewish Sabbath*. (And I suppose he did so. And, that he was Circumcised also, and did observe the Ceremonial Law.) But it was before his Death and Resurrection. I do not find that he observed it afterward.

But he says, after Christs Death when he had said *It is finished, he kept the Sabbath in the Grave*. Be it so (if that were *keeping a Sabbath*.) And the good Women *rested* on that day according to the Commandment. And why not? Since Christ was not yet risen; nor was the day yet changed, or pretended so to be. This therefore is but *Whimsey* and nothing to the purpose. We all agree; that, till the Resurrection of Christ, the Jews observed the *Jewish Sabbath*, on what they called the Seventh-day of their Week. But whether or no it were a Seventh from the Creation, we cannot tell.

'Tis more to the purpose what he tells us, that *Paul* and other Christians did after Christs Resurrection seem to observe the *Jewish Sabbath*; Going to the *Temple* and to the *Synagogues* on the Sabbath day; meaning thereby the *Jewish Sabbath*. And it is true; They did so go. But I answer;

1. So they did on other days as well as on the Sabbath, and in other places, as well as in the *Synagogue* and the *Temple*, *Act. 5.*

42.

42. *Dayly in the Temple, and in every house. or from house to house* (*καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς καὶ οἰκίαις αὐτοῦ*) they ceased not to preach *Jesus Christ*. And *Act. 2. 46.* they continued dayly καὶ ἡμεῖς μετὰ ἑαυτοῖς ἐν τῷ ἱεροῦ, and breaking bread at home, or from house to house. As to such duties of Worship as were common to them with the Jews, they took the opportunity of joining therein with them; whether on their Sabbath, or on any other day; but as to what was peculiarly *Christian*, this they performed in separate meetings from them; *breaking Bread at home, καὶ οἰκίαις, or from house to house*; The Sacrament of the *Lords Supper* (being peculiarly a *Christian service*) they did celebrate in their houses, or separate places of meeting. And so we find it at *Troas*; and, on the first day of the week; *Act. 20. 7. on the first day of the week, when the Disciples were met to break bread Paul preached, &c.* Their meeting for this *Christian service* was in a separate place, and on another day, from that of the *Jewish service*. And *Paul at Athens. Act. 17. 17. he disputeth in the Synagogue with the Jews, and with the devout persons, and in the Market, Dayly, (καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ ἡμεῖς,)* He took the opportunity of public meetings, whether in the *Synagogues* or elsewhere, whether on the Sabbath or any other day, to preach Christ to them, whether Jews or Greeks. Which doth not prove that they did then take the seventh day to be the *Christian Sabbath*; any more than our going to Hear or Preach a Week-day Lecture, suppose on *Thursday*, would prove, that we take *Thursday* to be our Sabbath: or *Paul's Preaching on Mars-hill, or in the Market-place*, would prove that he took these places to be the *Temple* or *Synagogue*. He knew these to be Times and Places of concourse, and therefore took the opportunity of Preaching Then and There; and would so have done at any other time and place as there was occasion: *In season or out of season, as he adviseth Timothy, 2 Tim. 4. 2.* He doth not deny, p. 122. but that *Paul did keep the Feast* (of the *Pass-over*) after the Resurrection of Christ; Because of what we have *Act. 18. 21. He bids them farewell (at Ephesus) saying, I must by all means keep this Feast that cometh, at Jerusalem; but I will return again unto you, if God will.* Which Feast he thinks to be that of the *Pass-over, though it be not named*. But whether that or whatever Feast of the Jews it be, it is all one as to our business. How great a proof would this have been for the *Seventh-day-Sabbath*, if it had been said *I must by all means keep the Sabbath!* 'Tis said indeed, he did on the Sabbath day go into the *Synagogue* (but so he did on other days,) but not that he kept the Sabbath

G 2

bath

bath day; much less that *he must by all means Keep it.* Or that he must *by all means* take a journey from Ephesus to Jerusalem rather than *not keep it*, though he were *to return thither again.* Yet this Author doth not, for all this think, the Law for the Jewish Pass-over to be then in force. But only that Paul took occasion to be there at that publick great concourse of People, to preach Christ to the multitude. For that the Apostles were under no obligation to keep that feast of the Pass-over, after the death of Christ, is to him (he says) *past doubt.* And why may not we say the same of his going into the Synagogue on the Sabbath day (rather than miss such an opportunity of a publick concourse) which was a less journey than from Ephesus to Jerusalem? though under no obligation to keep the Jewish Sabbath, more than to keep the Jews Pass-over.

2. But I answer further. The Jews who were not Christians, did yet continue to observe the Jewish Sabbath as a matter of duty. And there was no reason why they should not. They did not acknowledge our Christ to be the Messiah, nor the Mosaic Law to be at an end, but Circumcision and the Jewish Economy yet in force, there was no reason why they should not think themselves obliged to the Jewish Sabbath. And many of the Christian Jews, who were not yet satisfied of the Abolition of the Mosaic Law, did comply with them therein. For knowing this to have been a law once, and not yet being fully satisfied that it was expired, they were content still to observe it. (And if our Gentleman be of that mind, I would not hinder him, if a Jew from so doing; but neither would I encourage him.) And if the Apostles willing to connive at it, and even to countenance it. Not as a thing necessary, but at least allowable.

And though they did not think fit to bring a new Token upon the Gentiles, who had not before been obliged to the Jewish Law (and therefore would not allow the Gentiles to be Circumcised as appears by S. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, and the Decree of the Synod at Jerusalem, Act. 15.) yet he allowed the Jews to practise it (to whom it had once been a Law) and according to Circumcised Timothy Act. 16. because, though his Father were Greek, yet his Mother was a Jew: (but he did not Circumcise Titus Gal. 2. 3. for whom there was not the same reason.)

And he did himself comply with the Jewish ceremonies; Act. 18. 18. *Having shorn his head in Cenchrea; For he had a vow.* And those of Purification Act. 21. Not that he thought those Laws now obliging; but, because many of the believing Jews were yet zealous of the Law, and thought themselves obliged by it, would

would not give offense to them. For he was satisfied as to himself, that Circumcision availeth nothing, nor Uncircumcision, 1. Cor. 7. 19. Gal. 6. 15. But was content (till by time and further instruction they should be better satisfied) that each one should be gratified, as to their own practise, according to their own sentiments, as to things yet disputable.

And accordingly, as to eating or not eating things forbidden by Moses's Law, his advice was, to the Romans, (many of whom were Jews) Rom. 14. 17. *Let not him that eateth not, judge him that eateth,* (as breaking a Law which he thinks to be yet in force,) *nor let him that eateth, despise him that eateth not,* (as a fool that doth not understand his own liberty) *for the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, &c.*

And in like manner a new Token of Circumcision upon the Gentiles (to whom before it had not been a Law) yet do advise them to forbear things strangled and blood, because this had once been a Law to all the Sons of Noah, Gen. 9. 4.

Not but that even this was now antiquated, but (to avoid offense) because it had once been a Law. For I take even those things to fall under these Generals, *The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost,* Rom. 14. 17. and *every creature of God is good,* 1. Tim. 4. 4. *I know, and am persuaded that there is nothing unclean of it self:* But *All things indeed are pure,* Rom. 14. 14, 20. Tit. 1. 15. *Meat commendeth us not to God; for neither if we eat, are we the better* (as making use of our lawful liberty) *neither if we eat not* (in compliance with those who be unsatisfied) *are we the worse,* 2 Cor. 8. 8.

So that the Practice of the Apostles or of the Church at that time, in compliance with the Jews, as to what had before been a Law, but now was not; is no argument that the thing was then obligatory, as before it had been, but only an argument of their condescension in things of a middle nature, rather than to give offense to those who were therein unsatisfied; according to that principle of his *All things are lawful for me but all things are not expedient,* 1. Cor. 10. 23. *To give no offense either to Jew or Gentile, or to the Church of God;* ver. 32, 33. *To the Jews I became as a Jew; To the weak I became as weak; I am made all things to all men.* 1. Cor. 9. 19. In so much that even in those things which he knew to be lawful, yet, rather than give offense to a weak brother, he would forbear, *If meat make my brother to offend,* (or, be an offense to a brother) *I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my Brother to offend.* And

And the like I suppose as to the Jewish Sabbath; *He that regardeth a day regardeth it to the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks,* Rom. 14. 6. Where 'tis manifest that he doth parallel the observing or not observing a day then questionable; with the abstaining from meats disputable; that is, from such as before were unlawful, but now ceased so to be, though all were not yet therein satisfied.

And though it be not expressly said, what was the Day thus in question; yet it is most likely to be that of the Jewish Sabbath; For, that the first day of the Week or Christian Sabbath was now not to be observed any more, was the question whether the Jewish Sabbath for continuing Circumcision and the Mosaic Ceremonies, were doubtless for that also. And the Apostles Rule was for a mutual condescension (as to the Jews) for each to follow their own sentiments therein, without censuring one another.

But as to the Gentiles, he seems to be of another mind; And therefore to the Galatians, who were most of them Gentile-Christians, he would not so much as allow the practise of Circumcision (which to the Jews he did;) and tells them that if they be Circumcised Christ profiteth them nothing; and he that is Circumcised is debtor to the whole Law, Gal. 5. 2, 3. For it was a renouncing Christ who had made them Free; putting themselves under the Jewish Yoke, to which (even before) they were not subject.

And therefore to these he speaks more warmly, Gal. 1. 6, 7. *I marvel that you are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, unto another Gospel: Which is not another, (or, there being no other Gospel than this, where as there is not any other Gospel;) only there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ.* And such are those who would bring on them a new Yoke, (by making that a Duty which God had not made so.) Where he presseth them to keep close to the Gospel of Christ, as by him delivered (without any connexion of Moses's Law,) there being indeed no other Gospel but that; and they who teach them otherwise, do pervert the Gospel; the true Gospel of Christ, including no obligation to the Jewish Law; either as to Circumcision or the difference of meats, or other particulars of that Law; as he argues, in the second, third and fourth Chapters; shewing that even those who were before under it, are now freed from it, and they much more who were never under it. And there-

thereupon Chap. 4. 9, 10, 11. he rebukes them severely, that after they had known God (or rather were known of God) they should turn again to the weak and beggarly rudiments or elements. *Ye observe (saith he) days and months and times and years, I am afraid of you lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain.*

'Tis not indeed here said in particular, what those days were, that are here meant; yet it is most likely (and scarce to be doubted) to be meant of the Jewish Sabbath. For though other Observation of Times be here reckoned up (there being the same reason of all) yet there was no occasion for the others, in Galatia. For the Jews themselves did not think themselves obliged (nor do the Jews at this day) to the observation of their other Feasts or Fasts out of their own land. But to that of Circumcision, and of the Jewish Sabbath, and the distinction of Meats, they thought themselves obliged even out of their own land. And of such we must understand this to the Galatians. These being the things there in question; not those other, which were confined to the land of Canaan.

But he objects here, that though Days be mentioned, yet not Sabbath-days; and fancies it might be meant of some other days; not of Sabbaths. To gratify him therefore in this also, I will proceed to that of Colos. 2. 16. Where Sabbaths are expressly named.

To the Colossians, who were also Christian Gentiles, he pursues the same notions; *Least any one should beguile them with enticing words,* Col. 2. 4. (thereby to bring them under the Mosaic Law:) He bids them *Beware lest any spoil them through Philosophy and vain deceit.* Whereby, I suppose, he means the Mosaic doctrines or Philosophy of the Jews, (which Clemens Alexandrinus doth all along call φιλοσοφία βαρβάρων in contradistinction to that of the Greeks,) after the traditions of men, after the rudiments (or elements) of the world, and not after Christ, ver. 8. and that particularly of Circumcision ver. 11. (in the room of which, Baptism is come; ver. 12.) Christ, by his Death having blotted out the hand-writing of ordinances (meaning the Jewish Law) and took it out of the way, nailing it to his Cross, ver. 14. and (amongst other things) *Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink* (as if some were now clean others unclean, as under the Mosaic Law,) *or in respect of an holy day, (ἐστὶν ἡ ἑορτή) or of the new Moon, or of the Sabbath days, ἢ νομῶν αὐτῶν,* ver. 16. Where by Sabbath must needs be meant the Jewish Sabbath; the day which in common speech was understood by the word Sabbath.

For

For this, he hath two or three evasions. He doth commonly press hard in other places, that by *Sabbath* is to be understood the Jews *Seventh-day-Sabbath*, and no other. (*The holy Spirit doth call the Seventh-day, the Sabbath, and no other day of the week both in the Old and in the New Testament throughout*, p. 46.) And, I think, he is not much out therein; that it doth, usually, so signify where it doth not come with some intimation to direct us to some other sense. And why it should not be thought so to signify here, I see no reason. For though I take our *Christian Sabbath* to fall as properly under the word *Sabbath* in the Fourth Commandment, as that of the Jews; yet the word, in common use, having by this time become the proper name of that Day which the Jews so called, it was necessary (to avoid confusion) to give the Christian Sabbath another name; as that of the *Lords Day*, or the *first day of the week*. And consequently that the *Sabbaths* here mentioned, are to be understood (according to the then use of the word) of those Sabbaths. Not as if all days of *Holy Rest* were hereby forbidden; but onely the nicety of confining it particularly to that day which was then (in common speech) so called.

But he would not have it here understood of the *Seventh-day Sabbath* (as every where else) but some other *Ceremonial Sabbaths*; but what those are, he doth not tell us.

That there were some other *Feasts* observed by the Jews, which, in the Old Testament, are sometimes called *Sabbaths* (but very seldom,) I do not deny: nor that those come under the general Words in this place. But those do not seem to be here principally intended, because it is manifest to be understood of the Sabbath *there* in dispute. Now there was no occasion of a dispute concerning the observance of those other *Sabbaths*, amongst the Gentiles, out of the *Holy-land*. These observations being not thought obligatory, even to the Jews, but in their own Land onely. And it is expressly provided, *Deut. 16.* that these were not to be kept in any place promiscuously; *not within any of the Gates which the Lord thy God giveth thee; But in the place which the Lord thy God shall chuse to place his name there.* So of the *Pass-over*, ver. 5, 6. So of the *Feast of Pentecost*, ver. 11. So of the *Feast of Tabernacles*, ver. 15. And of altogether, ver. 16. And therefore, not out of their own Land. I do not deny but that they might, in private houses, eat the *Paschal Lamb*, (as Christ did, with his Disciples,) but not *Sacrifice* the *Pass-over*. For it was to be *sacrificed* in the Temple onely; and the *Feast of the Pass-*

Pass-over to be there solemnly kept. Not in private houses; and much less out of their own Land.

Nor do I remember, that any where in all the New Testament, the word *Sabbath* is used for any such Sabbaths: Nor can reasonably be supposed to be here meant of those *Feasts*, because it is put in contradistinction to them. *Let no man judge you in respect of a Feast, of the New-Moon, or of the Sabbaths.* Which yet I do not understand as if no Sabbath might now be kept, but that the Obligation to that Sabbath was now at an end.

Another evasion is this, He would have *σαββαται* (*Sabbata*) in the plural number, to signify *Weeks*, not *Sabbath-days*. The *Sabbath-day* being called, in the singular number, *σαββατον* (*Sabbatum*.) For he will rather play at small game than stand out. If we should allow him this, it would not advance his purpose at all. For if the business of *Weeks* be at an end, (that we are no longer to distribute our time into *Weeks*,) than that of the *Sabbath* much more, which he would have to be the seventh day of the *Week*.

But suppose we do allow that one Sabbath is to be called *Sabbatum* what are we to call two or more Sabbaths? Must not they be *Sabbata*? And if this be his meaning, then are we not to observe such *Sabbaths* any longer.

But what must we then say to *Mat. 28.1.* *εἰς τὸ σαββατον*, which we render *In the end of the Sabbath*, meaning thereby the *Seventh day Sabbath* then past, *τὴν ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν σαββατον* as it began to draw towards the first day of the *Week*: must we read it, at the end of the *Sabbaths* (because *σαββαται* is in the plural number,) when the *Sabbaths* (meaning the *seventh-day Sabbaths*) were now at an end, and the *First-day Sabbath* coming on in their place? If that reading please him; it will serve us as well.

But he is mistaken in his Criticism. 'Tis true that *σαββαται* in the plural number seems to be sometime put for a *Week* (but not *Weeks*, that I know of, as he would have it.) And so it is commonly taken to be where we find *εἰς τὸ σαββατον*, for the first day of the *Week* (but may as well be render'd, the first day after the Sabbath.) And so is *σαββατον* in the singular, as *Luk. 18. 12.* *μνηστω δὲ τοῦ σαββατου*, I fast twice in the week, I suppose he would not have us render it I fast twice on the Sabbath-day (though it be in the singular number,) as if he did fast twice upon one day. But thus rather, I keep two Fasts to one Sabbath, which is the same in sense with, I fast twice in the *Week*. In like manner as the *Olympiad*, may be taken sometime for that particular year on which were the *Olympick Games* (which were wont to return

H every

every fifth year inclusively, that is, as we use to speak the fourth year after the last Olympick; sometime for the interval of four years from the end of one Olympick to the end of the next following. So here, *Sabbatum* may be sometime taken strictly for the Sabbath-day; and sometime for the whole septiduum or week from Sabbath to Sabbath.

And so is *Sabbata* (in the plural number) taken also for a Sabbath-day; Thus I take it to be here, (*Mat. 28. 1.*) ὁπότε οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα ὁπότε ἡ ἡμέρα (speaking of the very same time) when the Sabbath was past. And in like manner, *Matth. 12. 1.* At that time Jesus went on the Sabbath day through the Corn, οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα (Sabbatis) in the plural number. And so it is in *Mark 2. 23.* ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. Yet it is meant but of one day, as appears by the parallel place (where the same is again related) *Luk. 6. 1.* ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. And so *Mat. 12. 5, 10, 12.* *Mar. 3. 4.* *Luk. 4. 31.* *Luk. 6. 2, 9.* And οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα in the Septuagint is commonly put for the Sabbath-day. I will not say *always* (because I have not examined it) but in all the places which I consulted. And even in the body of the Ten Commandments *Exod. 20. 8.* μνησθε τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἡμέραν (Remember the day of the Sabbaths; in the plural number.) And again ver. 10. τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα τῇ ἡμέρᾳ (but the seventh day Sabbaths to the Lord thy God;) So *Ex. 16. 13.* οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα ἀνάπαυς ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας αὐτῶν. (the Sabbaths a holy Rest unto the Lord, to-morrow.) And *Levit. 23. 3.* six days shall work be done, but the seventh is οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα the Sabbaths of Rest; ye shall do no work therein, οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα τῇ ἡμέρᾳ it is the Sabbaths of the Lord. Which are the signal places wherein the Sabbath is commanded. And the like very often (if not always) in the Septuagint, whose language the New Testament doth usually follow. So that his Criticism comes to nothing, but only to shew how careless he is of what he says if at least he may seem to say somewhat. (Such is that when he tells us p. 136. that God who hath reserved a Tenth of our Substance, hath reserved But a Seventh of Time. As though he thought a tenth part to be more than a seventh part. And many such negligences, which I spare to mention.)

But whether we render it *sabbath-day* or *sabbath-days* the sense is still the same. And the Apostles design in all these places seems to be this, that though to the Jews, to whom it had once been a Law, he doth allow a liberty (till they should be better satisfied) for each to follow his own judgment (without censuring others) as well in this of the Jewish Sabbath, as in the business of Circumcision, and the abstinence from Meats, and their other Rites;

yet

yet he would by no means suffer these to be brought upon the Gentiles as a new Yoke to which before they had not been subject.

I say as a new Yoke to which they had not been subject. For though I do admit that by natural light, or the Law of Nature, man ought to allow a competent time for the solemn service of God; and, by a positive Law, that it should be at least one day in seven, that is, after six days of Labour, the seventh to be a day of Rest; and so much to be intended in the Fourth Commandment: Yet, I do not think it to be so determined to this day in order, as to be unchangeable to after Ages.

We can be no ways sure, that the seventh day in order from the first raining of Manna, *Ex. 16.* was the seventh in order from the Creation. And as they did observe it then in order from thence; so when Christ, or his Apostles by direction from him, did put it into a new order, this new order doth as well suite the words of the Fourth Commandment as that former.

I do the rather say that this to the Gentiles is a new Yoke, because I find this to be given as a sign, a covenant, or distinctive mark given to the Jews, as Gods peculiar People, in contradistinction to other Nations; just as Circumcision was. So *Exod. 31. 13.* My Sabbaths ye shall keep, for it is a Sign between me and you throughout your generations, and ver. 16. The Children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations for a perpetual Covenant, and ver. 17. It is a Sign between me and the Children of Israel for ever. So *Ezek. 20. 12.* I gave them my Sabbaths to be a Sign between me and them; and ver. 20. They shall be a Sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God. Just as it is said of Circumcision, *Gen. 17. 7.* I will establish my Covenant between me and thee (saith God to Abraham) and thy seed after thee, for an Everlasting Covenant, to be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee: and ver. 10, 11. This is my Covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee, every male-child among you shall be Circumcised, and it shall be a Token of the Covenant between me and you: and ver. 13. My Covenant shall be in your flesh an everlasting Covenant, (not as if Circumcision were to be for ever obligatory; but *rebus sic stantibus*, so long as things continued in that estate.) And so it is called *Rom. 4. 11.* He received the Sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith. And such was the Blood of the Paschal Lamb on the Doorposts of the house, *Ex. 12. 7.* to be a distinctive mark between the Israelites and the Egyptians; as ver. 13. The blood shall be to you for a Token upon the houses where you are, and when I see the blood I will

H 2

I will

I will pass over you. And so *Ex. 11. 5, 6, 7.* *That ye may know how that the Lord doth put a Distinction between the Egyptians and Israel.*

And our Author himself, *pag. 26.* doth prels the same, and puts great weight upon it, that *this Seventh-day sabbath is often called a Sign for ever between him and them, and a perpetual Covenant, to Distinguish his People from others;* that is, the people of the Jews from other Nations. And so to be a *Sign for Ever*, as Circumcision is an *Everlasting Covenant*.

Now whatsoever was a *Distinctive Mark* of the People of *Israel*, from other Nations, as was that of *Circumcision*, the *Pass-over*, and the *Seventh-day-sabbath*, was at an end and to cease when the *Partition-wall was broken down* between Jew and Gentile, when *Christ had made both one*, and abolished in his *flesh the Enmity* (even the law of Commandments contained in Ordinances, to make of *Irreconcilable* One new man; to reconcile both in One body by the Cross, having slain the Enmity thereby, *Eph. 2. 14, 15, 16.* Or as it is *Col. 2. 14.* *Having blotted out the hand-writing of Ordinances which was against us, and was contrary to us,* (as separating us Gentiles from the Jews, and so excluding us out of Gods Visible Church,) and *nailing it to his Cross.* From whence he there infers, *ver. 16.* *Let no man Therefore judge you in meat or drink, or in respect of a holy-day* (a Festival) *or of Sabbaths,* (the proper name, at that time, of the *seventh-day Sabbath*;) *which things are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ;* these being but shadows or empty things, whereas it is the *body*, (the Substance) that Christ regards *αὐτὴν τὴν οὐσίαν, τὸ ὅτι οὐσία τὸ θεοῦ,* those are but shadows, but 'tis the *Body* that Christ looks at. That is, (in our language) those are only *Circumstantial*s, but 'tis *Substance* or the *Substantial*s of Religion that *Christ* and *Christianity* respects. And, as it is merely *Circumstantial* (and doth not at all influence Religion) whether in the *Temple* or other place God be worshiped (*Joh. 4. 21.*) So, whether on *this* or *another* day, a Sabbath be kept.

If therefore those Sabbaths (as is shewed) were distinctive *Marks* or *Signs* of Gods peculiar *Covenant* or *Contract* with the Church of *Israel* as *their peculiar God*, in contradistinction to other Nations; then 'tis manifest that those other Nations did not at all keep a *sabbath*, or not on *this Day*; (else how could this be a distinctive Mark?) and therefore to bring this now upon the Gentile, was to bring upon them a *new Yoke*.

I add further, that this *Jewish Sabbath* (as is shewed before) seems to be, not a Continuation of a former Sabbath from the Creation, (which I doubt was either not observed at all, or had long

long before this time been forgot,) but rather a New Institution or Restitution after their coming out of *Egypt* (from a new *Epocha*) at *Marah*; where God is said to have made a *Statute* and an *Ordinance*, *Exod. 15. 25.* to which *Commandment* and *Statute* if they would hearken diligently and give ear, he would not bring upon them the *Diseases* which he had brought upon *Egypt*, For (saith he) *I am the Lord that healeth thee*, *ver. 26.* Whereupon follows (in the next Chapter) a *sabbath* to be observed on the *seventh-day* from the first raining of *Manna*, (not from the first Creation.) And with reference to their *Rest* or *Refreshing* after their *Labour* or *Bondage* in *Egypt* (the first-born of the *Egyptians* were slain.) For so he saith, *Exod. 31. 13.* *My Sabbath shall ye keep, for it is a Sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you* (or separate you to my self as a peculiar people, a holy people;) and *ver. 16, 17.* *The Children of Israel shall keep my Sabbaths* (αὐτὰν) *for a perpetual Covenant; It is a Sign between Me and the Children of Israel for ever; for in six days the Lord made Heaven and Earth, and on the Seventh Day he Rested and was Refreshed.* Not that God was *Wearied* with his *Work*, and needed *Refreshment*; but he doth parallel his *Rest* after his *Work* of Creation, with their *Refreshment* after their *Labour* in *Egypt*.

And that God had a particular respect to their *Rest* and *Refreshment* from their *Labour* and *Bondage* in *Egypt*; is farther evident, not onely from the General Preface to all the Commandments, (*I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the Land of Egypt; out of the house of Bondage;*) but from the Close of this *Fourth* Commandment, as it is repeated in *Deut. 5. 12, 13, 14, 15.* (some-what different from what is in *Exod. 20.*) where, (instead of *For in six days the Lord made Heaven and Earth, &c. Exod. 20. 11.*) we have (*Deut. 5. 15.*) *And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand, and stretched out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day.* Which shews that *this Sabbath*, had a particular respect to *that deliverance*.

Now as God by *Moses* did, upon a New occasion (of their Rest from their *Labour* in *Egypt*) give a New *Epocha* or Beginning to a Circulation of Sabbaths, to be reckoned from thence, in imitation of his own Resting from the Work of Creation; Not by the *Fourth* Commandment (for that speaks indifferently as to any Circulation,) but by this *Ordinance* at *Marah*, or at *Elim* (for 'tis this de-

determines the Circulation to the *seventh* day after the raining of *Manna*;) So might Christ as well (by himself or his Apostles) fix another *Epocha* from his *Resurrection*; (as we have reason to think he did;) and this Equally within the prospect of the Fourth Commandment. This *Rest* from the *Egyptian Bondage*, being as much a *shadow*, of what Christ regards as the *substance*; as was the escaping of the *Egyptian Destruction*, of which the *Pass-over* was the Memorial. And accordingly this *Circulation* equally to cease with that of the *Pass-over*, at the coming of Christ; not. *New* Circulation from another of the *Fourth Commandment*, in a *pressy* said that Christ *Bid* his *Apostles* so to do: But as *indeed* presumed to do what he did by *Gods* direction; so the *Apostles* by *Christs* direction; to whom he gave *Commandments* for that purpose, *Act. 1. 2, 3.*

As to what he says so often; that not one *Jott* or *Tittle* of the *Law* (meaning that of the *Decalogue*) is *destroyed*, but doth still continue in force: This, as to the *substance of the Duty*, I grant. But if his meaning be, that there is not a *Word* or *Letter* therein which doth not as *literally* belong to *Us* Now, as it did Then to *Israel*: I cannot assent to it. For it cannot be said of all *Us* who are under that *Law*, that God hath *Brought us out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of Bondage*; or that *We* are to expect *long life, in the land* (of *Canaan*) *which he Gave Them*.

If he say that our deliverance from *spiritual bondage* is equivalent to theirs from *Egypt*, and our *land* the same to us as *Canaan* was to them: I grant it. But so is our *Lords Day* equivalent to their *Seventh-day-sabbath*, and Christ the *true Manna* (more than) equivalent to that of theirs, from the raining of which they reckoned their *Jewish Sabbaths*.

As to what he says of *Mat. 24. 20. Pray that your flight be not in the Winter, nor on the Sabbath-day*; which he thinks to be understood of the *Jewish Sabbath*, 38 years after Christs *Resurrection*. Perhaps it may. For the obstinate Jews, (who would not in their day understand the things that belonged to their peace, but rejected Christ,) did no doubt continue to observe their *Jewish Sabbath*, and thought themselves obliged so to do: And it would then be as great an *Affliction* to them, as if their *Sabbath* were yet in force: But no more a *sin* to fly on that day, than to fly in the *Winter*. It would be so to the *Christians*, if put to flight on the *Christian Sabbath* (for the case would be the like of both) and they might as well *Pray against it*: That is, *Against their Flight*

on

on the *Christian Sabbath*; as the *Jews* on the *Jewish Sabbath*. This therefore makes nothing at all to his purpose. He might as well argue from hence, that it were a *sin* to labour in *Winter*; as, on the *Jewish Sabbath*.

He hath many other little excursions, as little to the purpose, with which I shall not trouble my self or you; having fully answered what seems to me to have any appearance of Argument.

But he takes great pleasure to expose the Name of *Sunday*. Yet I do not find any more fond of using it, than he. Not, that he would be thought to *like* the Word, but because he thinks it a *Reproach*. If he do not like that name, he may call it as we do, the *Lords Day*, the *Christian Sabbath*, or (if he think these too good names for it) he may call it the *First day of the Week*.

But why not as angry with the *Monday*? or other of the *Week days*? If on *Monday* the Heathens (as he would have us think) did worship the *Moon*, as the *Sun* on *Sunday*, why is he not as angry with that? It is as much Idolatry to worship the *Moon* on *Monday*, as the *Sun* on *Sunday*. True. But that doth not concern the *Christians Sabbath* (which is what he hath I mind to reproach) and therefore he speaks little of the other, and but seldom: But *Sunday* is to be snubbed upon every occasion.

He would not have a *Sabbath* upon *Sunday*, because he says, on that day they worshiped the *Sun*. But why upon *Saturday* if on that day (as he would have us think) they worshiped *Saturn*?

Now 'tis true that some of the Heathen did worship the *Sun*, and the *Moon*, and the *Host of Heaven*. But that they did worship the *Sun* more upon *Sunday*, than they did upon *Monday* or *Tuesday*, is more than I know, or he can prove. He tells us, *Verstegan* says, that the *Heathen Saxons* did so. But *Verstegan* is too young an Author to settle this upon his own Authority; unless he can bring Vouchers for it more ancient than himself. It was, I suppose, a *Fansy* of *Verstegan* Then (as it is of our Author Now;) But I do not remember that he cites any Author ancients than himself. And though some others may say the like; Yet I look upon it but as a *plausible conjecture*, without any good foundation in History. And even the *Heathen Saxons* are too late for his purpose.

He tells us, p. 88. *The Heathen Nations long before Christs Birth did offer Sacrifice to the Sun, and worship it as a God upon Sunday*. His proof is from *Job 31. 26, 27, 28. If I beheld the Sun when it shined, or the Moon walking in brightness, and my heart hath been secretly enticed, or my mouth hath kissed my hand, this were an iniquity to be punished by the Judges, for I should have denied the Lord above.*

But

But what is all this to Sunday? It may perhaps be a disclaimer of *worshipping the Sun*; but says nothing of *Sunday*.

Doth our Author think the name of *Sunday* to be as old as *Job's* time? If *Job* had said, *If I have worshipped the Sun upon Sunday, or the Moon upon Monday, and not the Lord upon Saturday*; it had been to his purpose: But here is nothing of that. Not a word of *what day* it was on which they worshipped the Sun.

But I would not have him lay too great a load upon *Sunday*. For *Hesiod* tells us (as was said before) that in his time (one of the oldest of the Heathen Writers; though younger than *Job*) the *Seventh* day was *Sun-day*, not the *First*. And he hath nothing to shew (more than the bare *Name of Sunday*) to make us believe that those of the Heathen, who worshipped the Sun, did confine that worship to *this* day of the Week; or, Did more worship it on this day than on others.

I do not certainly know how Ancient those Names are of *Saturday, Sunday, Monday, &c.* nor upon what occasion they were first taken up, (nor is it much to our purpose.)

The most ancient Heathen Writer whom I know to have mentioned them is *Dio Cassius*, who lived about the Year of our Lord 230. Who speaking of the Destruction of *Jerusalem* and the *Temple*, tells us that the *Jews* had such a reverence for *Saturn's-day*, as that they would not *Labour* on that day for their Defence; which the *Romans* understanding, did on that day assault them; and prevailed. (Against their *Temple* and *Sabbath* both at once.) Not as if the *Jews* did then call it *Saturn's* day, (nor am I sure that any other did then so call it,) for they called it their *Sabbath-day*; But it was that day of the Week which, in *Dio's* time, was called *Saturday*.

But *Dio* speaks of it as a *new Thing* so to call the Days of the Week, and which the *Ancient Greeks* (he tells us) knew not. ('Twas therefore not very Ancient.) And therefore he supposeth the *Romans* to have taken it up from the *Egyptians*. Not the Old *Egyptians* of *Moses's* time, but rather from those about the time of *Ptolemy*; not of King *Ptolemy*, but of *Claudius Ptolemaeus* the Astronomer (or perhaps somewhat earlier) when Astronomy there flourished, and from whom the *Romans* had it.

In a Christian Writer, I find it earlier than *Dio*; in *Justin Martyr's* Apology, written about the Year of Christ 150. who mentions τὸ ἡμέραν, the *Day of the Sun*, as the Christian Sabbath. And *Tertullian* in his *Apology*, mentions *Saturday* and *Sunday*. And it may perhaps be found in Writers earlier than these, Though I do not at present meet with it. Nor do I think it worth

worth the while to make any great search about it. I grant, that when Christianity was spread among the Gentiles; and, with it, the Christian Sabbath; they did (in order to the observing that Sabbath) distinguish their time into *Weeks*; and thereupon gave Names to each Day. I grant also that the *Jews* did, before, so distinguish their Time: but I do not find that any other Nation did so. If any think, that All nations did so distinguish, and every Nation, all the World over, call the days by those Names by which they are now called: This I take to be but a *Presumption*, without proof.

But whenever those names were first taken up, I do not think they were taken from the *number of their Gods* (for then they must have had a great many more days in their Week than Seven, if each of their Gods must have a peculiar day:) But from the number of the *Planets*, which were then reckoned to be *seven*, and in this order *Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Sol, Venus, Mercury, Luna*. Though we now know the Planets to be more than Seven. (For the *Satellites* of *Jupiter* and *Saturn* are as much *Planets* as our *Moon*; but were not then known.) Nor were the Seven Planets always reckoned in the same order; but some had been thought to be *above* the Sun, which, before these names were given, were accounted to be *below* it. And therefore these Names must be at least so late. And certainly not so old as *Job's* time.

I take them not to be older than what are called the *Planetary Hours*, but to take their Rise from thence; and the Order of the Names to be thence determined. For having divided the Day into 24 Hours; Beginning with *Saturn*, the highest of the Planets, they assigned to him the *First* hour of one day, which thence they called *Saturn's* day; the Second hour to *Jupiter*; the Third to *Mars*, and so in order till they came to the Eighth hour which falls to *Saturn's* turn again, and so again to the Fifteenth, and the Two and Twentieth; and then the Three and Twentieth to *Jupiter*, the Four and Twentieth to *Mars*, and the next hour, being the first of the next day, to *Sol*. Which day doth thence take the name of *Sol* or *Sunday* (next in order after *Saturn*.) And, in like manner proceeding, the Eighth, Fifteenth, and Two and Twentieth hour of that day will fall again to *Sol*, the Three and Twentieth to *Venus*, the Four and Twentieth to *Mercury*; and then the first hour of the next day to *Luna*, thence called *Monday* (next after *Sunday*.) And, in like manner, the first hour of the following day to *Mars*; of the next to *Mercury*; the next to *Jupiter*; the next to *Venus*; and then again to *Saturn*; and so onward as before. And this I

take to be the true account of those Names, and in that Order: *Saturday, Sunday, Monday*, after which (in the Latine Denomination) follow the days of *Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, and Venus*.

But some of our Ancestors the Saxons, thought fit (as is supposed) to put in the Names of *Twisco, Woden, Thor, Frea*, (some of their Princes) instead of *Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, and Venus*, (as *Julius* and *Augustus*, amongst the *Romans*, gave their Names to the Months formerly called *Quintilis* and *Sextilis*.) From which Saxon Princes we have the Names of *Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday* and *Fryday*: the other days retaining the Names of their respective Planets as they did before.

This account (from the order of the Planetary Hours) *Dio* gives us of the Names of the Week-days, and of their Order. Why so called, and why in this Order.

He tells us of another account from the Principles of *Harmornicks*. Because *Dia-tessaron* (which we call a *Fourth*) is Reputed a *Concord* in Musick; therefore they might, beginning with *Saturn* (skipping two, *Jupiter* and *Mars*;) take the *Fourth Sol*: then (skipping the two next *Venus* and *Mercury*) take *Luna*: and then (skipping *Saturn* and *Jupiter*) take *Mars*: Then (skipping *Sol* and *Venus*) take *Mercury*: Then (skipping *Luna* and *Saturn*) take *Jupiter*: Then (skipping *Mars* and *Sol*) take *Venus*: Then (skipping *Mercury* and *Luna*) take *Saturn*; and so onward as before. But this account seems more *Forced*, and the former more *Natural*. Which therefore I take to be the true ground of this Order.

But either way, depending upon the order of the Planets as they were then accounted when these Names were given to the Week-days, it is at least so far evident that they cannot be older than since the Planets were accounted to be placed in this order. And therefore not so old as when *Venus* or *Mercury* or both of them were thought to be above the *Sun*. (For this would quite disturb the Order.) And therefore, certainly, not so old as *Job's* time.

Whether on each of these *Days* they did worship those respective *Planets*, as so many *Gods*, I cannot say; nor do I think it.

Nor do I think that each of those *Planets* have any more *Government* of their respective *Hours*, or *Days*, than of others. For I take the whole foundation as well of *These*, as of the other parts of *Judicial Astrology*, to be purely *Precarious*; and assigned onely at pleasure, by those whose business it was to amuse credulous people, and thereby to make a *Gain* of them.

But,

But, whatever were the occasion of the first imposing; these are now the known Names of those days. (And we need no more scruple the use of these *Names*; than to talk of *Pope Pius, Clemens, Boniface*, and *Innocent*; though possibly the Persons so called, had none of those good *Qualities*.) In like manner as we have a Spring near *Oxford* which we call *Aristotle's Well*; not that we think *Aristotle* was ever there, or was *Lord* of the place, and much less that he was wont to be *there Worshipped*; but we so call it as being now the *proper name* of the place (imposed at pleasure) by which it is known. And so for the days of the *Week*; whatever were the occasion of the first imposing, they now signify no more than the proper distinctive names by which the days are known.

And why we may not continue so to call them, I know not. We are told *Act. 17. 19, 22.* of *Paul's* being at *Arcopagus* or *Mars-hill*, because that was the known name of the place, without scrupling the reason why it was so called (whether, because *Mars* had been there worshiped, or for what other reason.) And *Act. 28. 11.* of a *Ship* designed by *Castor* and *Pollux*, or *Stowager*, without scrupling the reason of that name, or what relation these Stars had to *Jupiter*, so as to be called *his Lads*. And when *Paul* *1 Cor. 8.* allows them without Scruple to eat of things offered in Sacrifice to *Idols*, even though they knew, or had reason to presume them so to be, (unless when they might be suspected to do it with respect to the *Idol*) as the Apostle argues at large *1 Cor. 8.* and again *Chap. 10.* No doubt we may as lawfully make use of proper Names (whereby persons, times, or places be commonly known) without scrupling the occasion of their first imposition.

And I would desire those Gentlemen (who are so over scrupulous where there is no just occasion, and make it their business to throw Scruples and cast Stumbling-blocks before others,) to consider seriously, whose Work they be doing all that while; and whether it be not as truly and properly *superstition* to represent and quarrel with things as unlawful and sinful, which in their own nature are not so; as it is to introduce things under a pretence of holiness which have in them no such thing. And whether this be not to dote about questions and Strife of words: Whether these be not of those foolish and unlearned questions which we are advised to avoid; knowing that they gender strifes; and to avoid foolish questions, and genealogies and contentions about the law, for they are unprofitable and vain; and instead thereof to mind those things that are good and profitable to men; to follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, &c. as we are directed, *1 Tim. 6. 4, 5. 2 Tim. 2. 22, 23. Tit. 3. 8, 9.*

I 2

They

They do not consider how much the studying and prosecuting these *foolish questions*, and needless *Scrupulosities*, doth eat out the *power of Godliness* and true *Piety*, and the *Substantials* of Religion, while we busy our selves about these *shadows*; about little *circumstances* which do not at all influence the Substance of *spiritual* Worship.

There be so many *necessary duties*, and *indubitable truths*, in the serious practice of *Piety and Godliness*, that we need not trouble the heads of men (and make it our business so to do) with *doubtful disputations*.

It seems to be the design of the New Testament to take us off from the *Circumstantials* and *Scrupulosities* of Religion (which commonly produce *strifes* and contentions to no purpose) and put us upon *worshipping God in Spirit and in Truth*.

*Si Deus est Animus, nobis ut carmina dicunt,
Hic tibi precipue sit pura Mente colendus,*

Was well enough said of the Poet; and is a good Paraphrase on that, *God is a Spirit and will be worshiped in Spirit and in Truth*. I have been told long since of a Grave Divine, who when asked, Why he did not Preach against *Long hair* (which was at that time more Offensive than now it is,) gave this Answer; if he could but Preach Jesus Christ into their *Hearts*; he should not much concern himself for their *Hair*.

This Author tells us, p. 49, that our *Liberty* Gal. 5. 1. doth eminently consist in a *Freedome* not onely from the *Ceremonial Law* of old, but also in a *Liberty* not to be intangled with a new yoke of *mens devices*. I take *needless Scrupulosities* to be such; the making of more Sins than God hath made; the making or pretending of those things to be Sins which are no sins, and putting a *religious Necessity* upon things which are matters of meer *Prudence* and *Discretion*. Like those 1 Tim. 4. 3. *Forbidding to Marry*, or (as I would rather render it) *Bidding not to Marry*; and, to abstain from *Meats*, &c. *Forbidding* things as *Unlawful* which are not so; is alike *Superstitious* as to *Impose* things as *holy* which are not *Holy*; and equally contrary to the *Liberty* there intended.

Whether the days be called *Saturday*, *Sunday*, *Monday*, or *Alpha*, *Beta*, *Gamma*, is all one to me, (I take them as I find them;) I think we ought not to foment quarrels upon such trifles; and we sin if we do so.

Whether to meet once, or twice, or thrice, on a Sabbath-day, (if so as is most for edification and the real service of God,) is merely

prudential in this or that place, without laying a new religious yoke where God leaves it to *Prudence*. And if, in *Prudentials*, things be not managed sometimes with so much *Prudence* as we think they might, we must be content to bear with such *Imprudences* as we cannot help; and better so, than to pull-on greater *Inconveniences*.

Whether to begin the Sabbath at Six or Ten or Twelve a Clock on Saturday-night, is a thing (I think) not worth contending about, (so that it be religiously observed as to the *Substantials* of it,) and for which we ought not to disturb the Church where we live, but to follow *righteousness, charity, peace*; and avoid *foolish questions which gender strife*. It is much more, whether on this or that day, so the Sabbath be well kept: and I would by no means, on that account, give a disturbance to a Church where it is peaceably settled: 'Tis less material *When*, than *How*, a Sabbath be kept. And, in many cases, it must be unavoidably left to *Prudence*, whether this or that day be called the *First* or *Seventh* day of the Week. We are in such cases to study the things that make for *Peace*, and *wherewith one may Edify another*. Rom. 14. 19. The fruits of the *spirit* are *love, joy, peace*, &c. but *variance, emulation, wrath, strife*, are fruits of the *flesh*: Gal. 5. 20, 21.

To study and spin out *Disputes* into too fine a Thread (like that of a Spider out of her own Bowels) is but to pervert the *Simplicity* of the Gospel of Christ; to make that *Abstruse* and *Difficult*, which the Scripture would have *Plain* and *Easy*: in *Speculatives*, as well as *Practicals*. We should mind the *substantials* of *spiritual* worship; and not dote upon *circumstantials* further than as they do really advance the Substance. *Refuse profane and old-wives fables, and exercise thyself rather unto Godliness*; for *bodily exercise profiteth little*, 1 Tim. 4. 7, 8. Such are those Col. 2. 20, 21. *Touch not, taste not, handle not*, (and others of like nature) all which perish in the using, (there is no real advantage doth accrue from the use of them; 'tis but labour lost;) or 2 Cor. 12. 16. *they are but mischievous in their use*.

We complain of the Papists (and deservedly) for loading their Worship with a multitude of *Ceremonies* and mimical *Gestures*; the number of which would be a *Burthen*, even though singly they were *Tolerable*. Being so many *Diversions* of the mind from attending the *spirituality* of the Service. But they have some reason for it. For when much of their Devotion is either to be spoken so low as not to be *Heard*, or in such a *Language* as not to be understood,

stood, they have need of somewhat to gratify the *Eye*, when the *Ear* is not *Edified*.

And it is almost the same mischief, when mens Minds are amused with nice Speculations and needless Scrupulosities, whereby they are diverted from the Substantials of serious Religion.

Yet I would not so be understood, as if no care were to be had of *Corporeal* Worship, or the necessary Circumstances attending it. (For God expects the Worship of the Body as well as the Soul, and *Religious* Actions must have their *Circumstances*, as Time, Place, Gesture, and the like, as well as other *Actions*.) But these *Circumstances* of the Worship;) and as *Prudent* (not as the *Substance* of all other actions) as may, with Decency and Convenience, be in advance the *spiritual* Worship; and may be varied according as the diversity of times and places may require. Not to lay the weight of *Divine Institution* upon such little things. As if, because *Paul* *Kneeled down and Prayed* (*Act. 20. 36.*) therefore it were unlawful to use any other *Gesture* in Praying; Or as if, because *Christ* bids, *when thou Prayest, enter into thy Closet and shut the door.* (*Mat. 6. 6.*) therefore we may not Pray in the Chamber, Parlour, Dining-Room, or Chappel: Or, because *Christ* did Celebrate the Lords Supper, at *Night*, in an *Upper-room*, to *Men* onely, and but *Twelve*, and to those *sitting or lying*; therefore we may not do it at *Noon* or *Morning*, in a *Low-room*, to *Women* as well as *Men*, in greater *Numbers*, or in some other *Gesture*. For though such *Circumstances* may be *Lawful*, and sometime *Advisable* when convenient; yet to put a *Religious Necessity* upon them, as of *Divine Institution*, looks like a piece of *Superstition*.

And if we consider seriously how great a mischief many times some needless Scruples do create to the Church of God; how great a matter a little fire kindles; and how great hindrance to real Piety; it might justly make us wary how we add Fuel to such a Flame, and rather bear with some things we think amiss, (but may perhaps not be so) than by attempting to remove a suppos'd Evil create a greater Mischief.

As to the present point in question; I have said so much upon the whole, as I think might satisfy the Gentleman if he well consider it. Yet I know, when men have once espoused a notion of which they are fond; and have so long pored upon it as to rivet it in their mind; catching at every little thing that may seem to favour it, and slighting whatever makes against it; (as we find our Author doth very often;) And that hardly any thing

thing can be said so plain, as that there be nothing to be cavilled at, by one who is minded so to do; And that when God hath declared his Will as plainly as he thinks fit to do, if men will not be contented with reasonable evidence, he is not obliged to gratify their humours.

When (I say) we consider this; It looks somewhat like what *Solomon* tells us *Prov. 18. 19.* of a *Brother offended*, harder to be won than a *strong City*; and I must leave the success to God, who so teacheth as none like him.

He remits us to two Writers on this Subject, in defense of the Christian Sabbath, Mr. *Shepherd* and Mr. *Hughes* (whom I have not read, nor have them at hand,) and Two others whom he names not (nor know I well whom he means, for more than two have since written;) who, he thinks, do tacitly retract somewhat that those before had granted. And divers others have written on this Subject, tho' I have scarce consulted any of them. And particularly I have not seen what is written by Dr. *Young* or Mr. *Warren*, whom I find cited in a late Book of *G. T.* which came out since this was Written and part of it Printed. It is very possible, that some of those may have said much of what I now say, or that I may now say somewhat of what they have said before. But, in this, there is no hurt. If in some particulars I vary from some of them, it is not because I slight them, or out of a desire to contradict them, but freely to speak my own thoughts as they do theirs. Nor is it to be expected that all Writers on the same Subject should agree in every particular, (Nor is he to make advantage of it; For p. 3. he owns it is so also with those who are for the seventh-day:) But as to the main (I presume) we do well enough agree.

I have been a great deal longer than I did intend when I first began to write.

I shall give you a brief Summe of what I have said to this purpose, as to both Questions. (For the Question is double, though it seem to be but one.)

First concerning the *Jewish Sabbath*, Whether that be Antiquated and at an end. Secondly, concerning the *Christian Sabbath*, Whether there be sufficient ground for this to succeed in the place thereof.

As to the first; I agree with him in many things which he prosecutes at large, though not peculiar to his Question; As, That Our Lord *Jesus Christ* is God; that he is the Lord *Jehovah*, the God who made the World, who rested the seventh day, who brought

brought Israel out of Egypt, and gave the Law on Mount Sinai: For there is no other God.

But, this I say, he did as God (in Union with the Father and Holy Ghost;) not as Christ (God and Man) our Mediator and Redeemer. For he was not *then* Man; nor was there occasion of a Mediator and Redeemer before the Fall.

I agree also that the Decalogue (or Ten Commandments) is Obligatory to us Gentiles; (as being for the substance of it, a Law before it was so delivered on Mount Sinai.) And that the Fourth Commandment concerning the Sabbath is one of them; which requires after *six days* of Labour, the *seventh day* to be a Sabbath or day of Holy Rest. And our Christian Sabbath is such.

But it doth not say, *the seventh in course from the Creation*, nor doth it appear that the Jewish Sabbath was such, but rather the Seventh day from the *first raining of Manna*.

I do agree also that God himself did rest on the Seventh day from the Creation, Gen. 2. that is, he did *cease to Create*.

But I do not there find, that Man did so rest, or that there was any express command for him so to do on that day; much less for ever after, on every Seventh day in course from the Creation. How much may be thought to be implied in those words, he *blessed and sanctified it*, I will not dispute; However, it is but by Implication not by any express command; such as our Author demands for the Christian Sabbath.

Nor do I find that ever it was observed by Man till after the Israelites coming out of Egypt, or expressly commanded so to be.

Nor do I find that any other Nation (beside the Jews) did anciently so much as divide their time by Weeks. Since the times of Christianity they have: But that they did so, long before that time, I do not find.

I do agree also that after Israel's coming out of Egypt they did observe a Sabbath, Exod. 16.

But it was from a new command, (at Marah or Elim) which appeared New to them, not a continuation of a constant practise; and it was from a new beginning (the Seventh day from the first raining of Manna,) and as a distinctive sign or token, of Gods being their God in a special manner, as contradistinguished to other nations; (as himself owns p. 26. and 28.) and as a memorial of their Refreshing after their Bondage and Labour in Egypt, and feeding them with Bread from Heaven.

I do presume also that, they did, from this first raining of Manna continue a circulation of Weeks for a long time, and perhaps till the time of our Saviour. Yet

Yet we are not sure but that it might be intermitted in the *seventy years* of the Babylonish Captivity, and the day forgotten; and then restored a-new by Nehemiah (from a new beginning) Neh. 13. as he restored the Feast of Tabernacles (Chap. 8.) which had been intermitted from the days of Joshua the son of Nun to that day. But I rather think, the memory was preserved (by Tradition) during those *seventy years*.

I agree also that the Church of the Jews was the most visible Church of God, but I am loth to say (with him, p. 79.) it was the whole visible Church; For I presume there might be many Good men of other Nations, who worshiped the true God (of whom we have no History,) though not joined to the Jewish Church, nor were (that I know of) obliged so to be. Such was Melchizedek (whoever he were) not of the seed of Abraham, much less of Israel. And such was Job, and his Friends from divers Countries (of whom, were it not for the story of Job, we should have had no knowledge,) nor are we to think these were the only persons of those Countries who worshiped the true God. And how many such were in other Nations, we cannot tell. Who might, if they had opportunity, join as Proselytes with the Jewish Church, when established. But I do not think they were necessarily obliged so to do, or to keep the same Sabbath with them.

For I take it to be true, even before Christs coming, that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him. Act. 10. 34, 35. Whether Jew or Greek, Rom. 2. 10, 11. 1 Pet. 1. 17. Which are but Quotations from Deut. 10. 19.

Nor do I find that any Nation, except the Jews, did observe the Jewish Sabbath. But I rather take it to be a distinctive sign of them from other Nations, Ex. 31. 13, 17. as Circumcision and the Pass-over were; which, when the wall of partition was taken away, ceased also.

Yet, as to what was Moral in them (the Circumcision of the heart; being pointed at by that of the Flesh; and the old leaven of malice and wickedness to be put away instead of that of Bread; and a rest from Sin of more respect with God than that from Labour;) we have instead thereof, Baptism, in the room of Circumcision; the Lords Supper, in the room of the Pass-over; and the Lords Day, or Christian Sabbath, instead of the Jewish. And, as that took date from the raining of Manna after their deliverance from Egypt; so ours from the Resurrection of Christ, the true Manna.

I agree also that the Apostle, and other Christians, even after Christs Resurrection, did go to the Temple and the Jewish Synagogues on their Sabbath.

74 The CHRISTIAN SABBATH. Part I.

Sabbath days (and did there assist at Prayers, and Reading the Law, and other Services common to Jews and Christians) on a like account as when we now meet to hear a Sermon, or keep a Fast or Thanksgiving on a Week-day.

But so they did as to Circumcision, and other Jewish Rites. As when Paul circumcised Timothy, and joined in the Jewish Rites of Purification, Act. 21. on account of those believing Jews who were yet zealous of the Law: To testify to them that he had been misrepresented by those who said he did teach the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, and that they ought not to circumcise their Children, nor to walk after the Customs. Whereas indeed he taught that the Gentiles ought so to forbear, (as being a new yoke to which before they were not subject,) but as to the Jews which were amongst the Gentiles he did allow them (if not yet satisfied of their Christian Liberty) so to practise. For he puts a great difference between the Gentiles, and the Jews among the Gentiles; of which I doubt our Author doth not take notice; else he would not tell us (p. 39.) of Paul's writing one thing, and practising another. He preached and wrote against Circumcision as to the Gentiles; but allowed it to the Jews; and himself practised it, As to Timothy (a Jew) but not as to Titus who was no Jew. And the like we may say as to the Jewish Sabbath on their Seventh day.

As to what Services were peculiarly Christian (as breaking of Bread) they did it not at the Temple or Synagogues, but *at home, or from house to house*, Act. 2. 46. and on another day, the first day of the Week, Act. 20. 7.

Now this is all that he hath to urge, for the Jewish Sabbath in particular: which he cannot shew to be commanded to all the World (but rather to them in particular in contradistinction to the rest of the World,) nor that it was a Seventh day from the Creation, but from the first raining of Manna. For the Fourth Commandment saith nothing of this Sabbath in particular, but onely of the seventh day after six days of labour.

As to that Imperious demand, p. 40, 48, 64. *Where is there any such Power recorded in Scripture to be given to any Man or Men whatsoever, after Christ had said It is finished, to alter the Seventh-day Sabbath instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ?* I doubt he hath forgotten that the same God who gave the Law of the Ten Commandments, gave also the Ceremonial Law; and if it were the Lord Jesus Christ who gave the one, it was he that gave the other also. And will he then ask *Where is there any power recorded in Scripture to be given to any man or number of men to abolish Circumcision and the rest of the Mosaic Rites* insti-

Part I. The CHRISTIAN SABBATH. 75

instituted by the Lord Jesus Christ? I know no such power recorded in Scripture to be given, as to Circumcision and the rest, more than as to the Jewish Sabbath. And we find them both put together Col. 2. 11, 16. Or will he say, *Where is any Power recorded in Scripture to be given to any Man or Men, (after Christ had said It is finished,) to appoint Elders and Deacons and other Officers in the Christian Church, and give Orders concerning it, which Christ (before he so said,) had not given?* Yet we know Circumcision was abolished, and such Officers and Orders given. So that all this is but Flourish.

As to that of Christ having said *It is finished*; whatever be meant by that, we know that the whole Order and Constitution of the Christian Church was settled after that time: And whatever else be signified by it, it is not meant that there was nothing to be done further concerning it; For, if so, to what purpose did Christ give Commandments to his Apostles, of things pertaining to the Kingdom of God after his Resurrection, if nothing were to be further done?

And if we consider the Apostles deportment; We do not find them any where insist *Authoritatively* upon a Power given them from Christ, to Abrogate Circumcision or the like, and thereupon to proceed *pro imperio*. But they argue it from the nature of the thing, That what was Typical of Christ, was at an end now Christ is come; That what was Distinctive of the Jews from other Nations, was now to cease when the partition wall was broken down; That what were but shadows as to the Substantials of Religion, were now to pass away, as beggarly Rudiments, Christ regarding the Body or Substance not the shadows; *τὰ σκία ἢ μυστήρια*, these are but shadows in comparison of what Christ came to settle, *τὸ σῶμα τῆς χάριτος*, but 'tis the Body (the Substance) that Christ respects, Col. 2. 17.

They do not command but argue. They do no where pretend that God or Christ had given them Authority to Abrogate a Law which God had made; But Argue (from the nature of the thing) that the Law was ceased; and was not intended to Oblige longer: That the Law was now Antiquated or Expired when the End for which it was made was attained: That the Types were at an End, when the Thing Typified was Exhibited: That the Distinctive Marks were now no more of Use, when Jews and Gentiles were United: That the Elements or Rudiments (*στοιχεῖα*) which God (for reasons best known to himself) thought fit for the Training up of his Church while in a State of Minority (wherein a Child though Heir of All doth little differ from a Servant) should now cease when it comes to full Age, Gal. 4. And to the same purpose Heb. 8. He argues that the Old Covenant was at an end when a better Covenant was come in

the room; citing that of Jer. 31. *Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a New Covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: Not according to the Covenant which I made with their Fathers when I led them out of the land of Egypt, For this is the Covenant that I will make, That I will put my laws into their Mind, and write them in their Hearts.* Meaning, instead of an outward Ceremonial Service, he would establish a service more Spiritual. From whence he concludes the *Antiquation* of the Former: *In that he saith a New Covenant, he hath made the first Old: Now that which Decayeth and waxeth Old, is ready to Vanish away (or, to expire.)* They do not claim a Power, to *Abolish a Law of Gods making*; But prove by *Argument*, that these Laws are *Antiquated or Expired*; as not being intended, by the Law-maker, to bind longer than till such a time. As Rom. 7. *The Woman is bound by the Law to her Husband as long as he lives; But if the husband be Dead, she is free from the Law: Not that the Law is Abolished; but the Case is Altered.*

And it is from these Considerations that he *Argues* against *Circumcision* Col. 2. 11. and the *Jewish Sabbath*, ver. 16. For as to the *Substantials* of the Service, provided a Sabbath be duly kept, it is much one whether on the *Seventh* or the *First* day. Now these (*Substantials*) are (he tells us p. 83.) *a lively spiritual Converse with the Father, Son and Holy-Ghost, in private Duties and publick Ordinances (where they can be had,) and in a Holy Rest all that day, saving emergent cases of Necessity and Mercy.* Which may be equally done on either day.

But as to those who were not satisfied with these *Arguments*; (if they were such as were before under those Commands) he doth not urge his *Authority*; He leaves them to practise according to their own judgment (but without censuring others) till they shall be better satisfied, as in Rom. 14. But as to the *Gentiles*, who had never been under these Laws, the case was otherwise. Which makes him argue otherwise with the (*Gentile*) *Galatians, Ephesians, and Colossians*, than with the *Christian Jews at Rome*.

And as to his Question, p. 47. *When, where, and by whom*, it was taken away, I say *Then, there, and by the same*, who took away *Circumcision* and the other *Mosaick Rites*. That is, *Fundamentally* by *Christ* at his death *who nailed them to his Cross*, after which they ceased to be *Obligatory*; But *Executively* and *Practically* by his *Apostles*, and the *Christian Church*, according as they did (leisurely and in time) come to understand their *Liberty*.

All which we are to presume they did according to such directions as *Christ* gave them. For (as this Author observes p. 80.) *Paul,*

in those Primitive times, when the Ceremonial Law was fresh in memory, and the Gospel newly preached, had much a-do to remove the first converted Jews from Circumcision and other Ceremonials, (and so from their Jewish Sabbath;) therefore these things were to wear off by degrees, and not to be torn from them all at once.

And this I think is enough (to a person not prejudiced) as to the *Removal of the (then) Jewish Sabbath*; appointed by *Moses* after their coming out of *Egypt*, on the *seventh day* from the *first raining of Manna*, and not given to all the world, but to be a *distinctive sign* of them from other Nations.

Now as to the other Point in Question, the *Observation of the Lords day*: I would ground that originally on the *Fourth Commandment*; which doth appoint a *Seventh day of Holy Rest*, after *Six days of Ordinary Labour*. Which doth directly concern the *Substantials* of *Worship* (that a Sabbath be kept and God thus served), but whether on this or that day of the *Seven*, is merely *Circumstantial*, and (as *Paul* calls it) a *Shadow*, in comparison of the *Body or Substance*, which is, he tells us, what *Christ* respects.

But then as to that, *Why the First day* rather than another? I answer, *First*, Here was a much more memorable Accident, of *Christs Resurrection*; than was that of *Raining Manna*, from whence the *Jewish Sabbath* takes its date, as the *Seventh day* from it (not from the *Creation*) or that of the *Quails* the Night before, (the first day that God fed them by Miracle from Heaven,) And therefore stands as fair for beginning such a Circulation of Weeks and Sabbaths.

We are told Jer. 16. 14, 15. and Jer. 23, 7, 8. *Behold the days come (saith the Lord) that it shall no more be said, The Lord liveth that brought up the Children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; But, The Lord liveth that brought up the Children of Israel out of the North Country.* Not, that the former deliverance was to be forgotten; but a greater than it did make it (comparatively) to disappear (as when the light of the Sun doth obscure that of the Moon and Stars;) And so here, the *Resurrection of Christ* to be commemorated paramount to that of former Mercies.

Next, in pursuance of this Occasion, we find our Saviour did on that day of his *Resurrection*, appear to *Mary Magdalen* and the other Women, declaring to them the *Doctrine of the Resurrection*; then, to the two Disciples going to *Emmaus*, Preaching to them (at large) the same Doctrine, and Celebrating with them the *Lords Supper*; and afterward (the same day) to those assembled at *Jerusalem* (with other Sabbatical works) and solemnly *Blessing* that Convention. And if our Author by *blessing the Seventh day* Gen. 2. would have us understand

stand an *Institution* or *Command* to observe it; We have as much here; Christ joined in this Assembly, and *Blessed* it. For so much is intimated in that his solemn *Benediction* (a first and second time, *Joh. 20. 19, 21.*) *Peace be unto you; and he breathed on them saying, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.*

He did so a second time on the same day the next Week; he *Assembled* with them (in Religious Services) and *Blessed* them.

He did (according to his Promise made on that first day of his Resurrection) send on them that miraculous *Effusion of the Holy Ghost* on the day of *Pentecost*, which being the Fiftieth day from his Resurrection, was therefore the *first day of the week* as was that of the Resurrection. On which day of *Pentecost* we find them also otherwise exercised in Religious Employments, and attested further by a miraculous conversion of *three thousand souls*.

We find St. Paul at Troas *Act. 20. Preaching to the Disciples assembled* (as it seems their manner was) *on the first day of the week to break bread*; that is, to celebrate the *Lords Supper*.

That such Assemblies were wont to be at Corinth, *on the first day of the Week*, the Apostle presumes, or takes for granted; and gives direction for a *Collection* to be then made, *1 Cor. 16.*

And he had done so before, as he there signifies, to the Churches of *Galatia*; presuming or taking for granted, that they also did so use to meet on the first day of the Week.

And we have no reason to doubt but that such meetings were wont to be in other Churches. We cannot doubt but that other of the Apostles did disperse themselves into other parts of the World, though we have not a like account of their Travels, as we have of Paul's recorded by St. Luke: But we are to presume (though it be not recorded) that their Doctrine and Practice was consonant to his; and that accordingly they had such weekly meetings on the Lord's Day, as these Churches had of whom we have the History.

Hence that day had the name given of *the Lord's-day*, *κύριος ημεραν*, as we find it called *Rev. 1. 10.* (as that of the Sacrament is called *δείπνον κυριακόν* *the Lord's Supper*, *1 Cor. 11. 20.*) which name it retaineth to this day, and for such purpose.

And all this, I think, is sufficient for us to continue our Observation of the same day. I am sure 'tis much more than he can shew for his *seventh-day Sabbath* for more than *two thousand five hundred years* from the first Creation.

It is not necessary that we have express words of Command recorded: We have no Record in Scripture of such express words of Command for the *seventh-day Sabbath*, till after *Israel's coming out of Egypt*;

nor

nor for the *Worshipping of God by Sacrifice*; nor for other things which yet were *Duties* before any *Record* of such express words of *Command*. It is enough if we can otherwise collect it to be God's Will, according to the best light we have.

If this Gentleman think himself obliged to keep the Jewish Sabbath also: this doth not hurt us. This, I think, was the case of the *Christian Jews* at first. I do not much question but that they did, as other Christians, observe the Lord's Day. The doubt was, whether they were not to observe also the Jewish Sabbath as before they did. And these *Believers* who were yet *zealous of the Law*, and thought themselves obliged, *together with Christianity*, to observe the *Law of Moses*, did no doubt think themselves equally obliged to the *Jewish Sabbath*. Those who thought themselves obliged to be *Baptized*, and to be *Circumcised* also, thought themselves in like manner obliged to observe the *Lord's Day* and also the *Jewish Sabbath*. And (till they should be better satisfied) the Apostles permit (*the Jews*) so to do.

If this do not satisfy him; I have yet two Expedients for him.

1. Let him begin his *Week* on *Monday*, and then *Sunday* will be the *Seventh-day*. Whether the Seventh in course from the Creation, I cannot tell; nor can any man living inform me. But it will at least be the *Seventh* day of *His Week*.

2. If he be not satisfied with this: My next Expedient is thus. Let him take a Voyage round the World, as Sir Francis Drake did. Going out of the *Atlantick Ocean* West-ward by the Streights of *Magellan* to the *East-Indies*; and then, from the East, returning by the *Cape of Good Hope* (the usual way) homeward. And take with him as many as please of those who are of his mind. And let them keep their *Saturday-sabbath* all the way. When they come home to *England*, they will find their *Saturday* to fall upon our *Sunday*; and they may thenceforth continue to observe their *Saturday-sabbath* on the same day with us. Which is the second Expedient.

If you ask, How this can be? I will make it very plain, that so it will be, and so it must be. For, Supposing the Earth to be Round, and the Sun moving from East to West; you must allow that it comes sooner to the Eastern parts than to the Western. It will sooner be *Noon* in *Holland* than in *England*, and sooner here than in *Ireland*.

If you ask, How much sooner? We say, that *Fifteen Degrees* of Longitude West-ward, makes it an *Hour* later. As if he Embark about *Dover*, *Yarmouth*, or other Port on the East-side of *England*, and Sail as far West-ward as the West of *Ireland* (or a little farther) it will be an *Hour* later, and not be *Noon* there till it be *One a clock*

at

at the place where he Embarked. And so in proportion, an *Hour* for every *Fifteen degrees*. And accordingly, when he hath gone round the whole Circle of *Three hundred and Sixty Degrees*, (that is Four and twenty times Fifteen,) it will be later by *Four and twenty hours*, That is, it will be but *Saturday-noon* with him, when it is *Sunday-noon* with those who staid here. That is, His *Saturday* will be Our *Sunday*. And thenceforth his *Saturday-Sabbath* will be the same day with our *Sunday-Sabbath* ever after.

And this, I think, should fully satisfy him. For he tells us, p. 39. *The variety of the time of the Sun-rising or setting in different Climates doth no way disturb; for that a day longer or shorter is still a day, and but a day.*

Most certain it is he who shall have thus sailed round the World will have had one day fewer than those who staid here. So it was with Sir *Francis Drake* and his Company: And so it hath been with all who have taken such a Voyage, (as many have done, for it is not a rare case:) and so will be to any who shall so do.

What he would resolve upon this case, or what he thinks Sir *Francis Drake* was to do when this happened; I cannot tell.

If he would go on to reckon the days according as they had happened to him in his Voyage; then this Expedient must fully satisfy him. For then he keeps his *Saturday-Sabbath* on our *Sunday*.

If he thinks the account should be rectified when or before he comes home, and call the days thenceforth as he finds those to do that staid here, what shall be come of that day he hath lost? and which day of the Week shall he reckon that to be?

And, When must he rectify that account? when he comes home, or somewhere by the way? For it would be just the same, if, before he come at *England*, he should have landed in *France* or *Spain*, or on the Coast of *Africk*, or even at the *East-Indies*; and all the way from thence, he would still be a day behind them. And so he would be with every Ship that in his way he should meet with. If he and such other Ship meet at the Isle of St. *Helens* to take fresh water, his *Saturday* will be their *Sunday*; and on which of the two days are they to keep their *Sabbath*? or must they keep it one on the one day, and the other on the other?

If he say that the account is to be rectified by the way (before he comes home) then Where? or When? and by What rule? For when ever he doth so rectify it, he must then begin to call *Sunday* what just before he was to call *Saturday*.

If he say, This must be left to Discretion, when, and where: Then must it be matter of discretion (and not determin'd by the Fourth Commandment) on which of the two days in question the *Sabbath* shall be kept.

But then here will again come in our amazing doubt (as p. 48, 86, 87.) *What man or men, without an high Usurpation of the Divine Authority, contrary to the First Commandment, shall pretend good intentions, assume an authority of their own heads, to appoint (for this or that place; suppose the Streights of Magellan) what day shall be the Lords holy Sabbath? Who, but our Lord Jesus Christ, that is Lord of the Sabbath, hath power to institute a Sabbath-day? If the Church or any part thereof be once admitted to have such Power, what Bolts or Locks will be strong enough for such a Door, to keep it from letting in upon the Churches of Christ whatsoever pleaseth those in Power?*

I shall not much trouble myself to answer all this Warmth. But (when that is over) if at or near the *Streights of Magellan* (a place, I think, not inhabited, or not by Christian,) a Colony be planted by some from hence, and some from the *East-Indies*; those who come thither from hence will (according to their account) call that *Saturday*, which those who come thither from the other side will (according to their account) call *Sunday*: Must they have no Sabbath at all? (that's against the Fourth Commandment:) Or must they by consent agree upon the day? (this I should think, if he would give me leave:) Or must they keep it some upon one day some on the other? This I would by no means advise, if it may be avoided: Because it would be a manifest confusion and disorder; And they would not both (if either) be the *Seventh-day* in course from the Creation: And which of them is so, is not possible for any man to know. And it would be more for common Edification that they do agree upon a common day. And not much matter, whether of the Two.

This Gentleman, if he can consider of it calmly, I am apt to think will be of the same mind; and think it better to have such a Sabbath than none at all; and that the little circumstance, whether on this or that day, should be disregarded in comparison of the Substantials of the Duty.

There be many things which the *Word of God* or the *Divine Law* doth determine in *These*, which when in *Hypothesis* they come in practice, will require the intervention of *Prudentials* or *Humane Laws*. The Eighth Commandment says, I must not *Steal*, or take unduly from my Neighbour what is His: But, What is Mine, and what is my Neighbours, will depend much upon Humane Laws; and, what shall be reputed a Trespass on my Neighbours land; or, a forfeiture of his right. The Seventh Commandment says, *Thou shalt not commit Adultery*: But it will depend much upon Humane Law, what shall be reputed a Good Marriage. The Sixth Commandment says *Thou shalt not Kill*: But it will much depend upon Humane Law what shall be re-

puted Self-defense, or a Just War, or a Forfeiture of Life. The Fifth Commandment requires us to *Honour and Obey our Parents*; But, in many cases, 'tis Humane Law that is to determine, who is to be reputed the Father. If a Widow be left with Child by a former Husband, and marry another before that Child be born (which sometime happens;) 'twill be a point in Law, not in Divinity, to whether of the Two Fathers this Son shall be Heir. And if my Father require me to part with what Estate is my own, 'twill be a point in Law, how far I am required to obey such a Command. (And the like as to other *Superiours*, as well as *Natural Parents*.) And those Laws which seem Absolute (as *Thou shalt not Kill*, *Thou shalt not Steal*, &c.) Have yet their Tacite *Limitations* implied. For no man doubts but there are cases wherein to *Kill* may be lawful; as in *Self-defense*, in a *just War*, and for *Capital Crimes*; And in such cases, to take from our Neighbour what was His. And, notwithstanding the Command of *Honour thy Father and Mother*, or that of *Children obey your Parents in all things*; there may things happen, wherein we are not obliged to do what they bid us. And in all such cases there is room for *Prudence* to interpose. Not, to Abrogate or Repeal a Law of God; But to judge what is the true Intent of that Law. So notwithstanding that Command of the Sabbath, *In it thou shalt do no manner of work*; yet our Saviour tells us, *The Priests in the Temple profane the Sabbath and are blameless*; and against the Pharisees *superstitious rigour* he argues, not onely from his own Authority (*The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath-day*) But from the Reason of the Law, *The Sabbath was made for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath*; and consequently is so to be understood as may be for the Good of Man (spiritual and bodily) not for his Hurt. And our Author allows the *emergent cases of Necessity and Mercy*; And no man doubts but that if a *House be on Fire*, we may *Labour to quench it*. In all which cases *Prudence* may be used, but must not (upon that pretense) be *Abused*. Not as if it were left to our Prudence, whether or no the Law of God shall be Obeyed; But, what is, in such cases, the true *Intendment* of the Law of God. And there needs no other *Locks or Bolts*. (as our Author speaks) to confine *Prudence* in such cases, than in all other *Prudential Acts*. So when the Fourth Commandment requires us to *keep holy the Sabbath-day*; it may yet, in many cases, depend much upon *Prudence* or *Humane Laws*, which day shall be reputed the Sabbath. And if this Author tell us, it must be the *Seventh* in course from the Creation; We are never a whit the nearer. For though he take great pleasure, on all occasions, to exclaim against *Tradition*; yet he must admit a great deal of *Tradition* to intervene before he can prove this or that day to be a Seventh in course from the Creation.

I am apt to think also, that when he hath well consider'd the case of *Sr. Francis Drake* (and many more since that time, who sailing round the world, as he did, have lost a day,) he will come to one of these two Resolutions: Either that when he comes back to *England* he must continue to call that *Saturday* which on his account was so; (and then his *Saturday-sabbath* will be the same with our *Sunday*;) Or else that his account must be somewhere rectified in his Voyage by skipping a day; and then and there beginning to call *Sunday* what, just before, he was to call *Saturday*.

Now because there is nothing in Nature to determine where this must be; nor is there any thing of Divine Institution (that I know of) to determine where it shall be; It seems to me to be Prudential, or most rational, (if nothing intervene to counterbalance it,) to be at what we call the *first Meridian*, from whence we reckon the Degrees of Longitude, Eastward, 1, 2, 3, &c. and so onward till we come round to 360, at the same Meridian again; and thence begin to reckon onward 1, 2, 3, &c. as before, for another round.

This first Meridian, in *Ptolemy's* time, was accounted to be about the Western part of the *African* shore; as being the most Western part of the World then known. Of later times, Geographers have been pleased to remove it more West, about the Islands called *Azores*, or the *Flemish Islands*. But all agree to place it between our Continent and that of *America*. And if from that Meridian, from whence we reckon the beginning of Longitude, we reckon also the beginning of Days; then the last of *Saturday* must there end, and the first of *Sunday* must there begin. And therefore at that Meridian the sailors round the World should rectify their account, calling it *Saturday* on the one side of it, and *Sunday* on the other; that being the latest of *Saturday*, and the soonest of *Sunday*.

He will tell me perhaps, that, by this account, if We keep our Sabbath on *Sunday*, those in *New-England* must be said to keep theirs on *Monday*, as being on the other side of that Meridian. And 'tis true, it would so follow. And therefore I did interpose, *if nothing else do intervene to counterbalance it*. And this is what I did at first intimate, as disputable, whether we and they in *New-England* are to be said to keep our Sabbath on the same day.

But it is the same case as to the whole Continent of *America*. And the same resolution will reach all.

And therefore, the thing being once settled by the common consent of all, I would by no means advise to change the day.

For the placing the *first Meridian* is purely *Arbitrary*. It might as well have been placed beyond *America*, (if men had so pleased,

and that *America* had been known in *Ptolemy's* time) as on this side: (And we might have numbred our Degrees of Longitude Westward, as now we do Eastward:) And may be so reputed now, if men so please (as it is now reputed about 10 or 15 degrees more to the Westward than it was in *Ptolemy's* days.)

And it is purely *Arbitrary*, where to begin to change the name of the day which is to be so called; whether at the First Meridian, or else-where.

And consequently 'tis purely *Arbitrary* or *Discretional*, whether in *America* such day shall be called *Sunday* or *Monday*. There is nothing in the *fourth Commandment*, nor in the *Word of God*, to determine it.

But it so happening, that *America* hath been peopled from *Europe*, traveling Westward from hence (without taking notice that we cross the first Meridian,) we have reckoned the days (and so named them) according as they appeared to those upon their Voyage who went thither. Whereas if it had been peopled (I mean, as to the Christians there) from *Asia* and the *East-Indies* (by people coming thence to the other side of *America*) what there is now called *Sunday*, would (for the like reason) have been called *Monday*: and the Fourth Commandment equally observed either way.

And upon a like account Christians in the *East-Indies*, and in *China* and *Japan*, traveling Eastward from hence thither, do call their days there according as they appeared to fall out to them in the course of their Voyage.

Now 'tis true, that some part of the day which we here call *Sunday*, is coincident with some part of what is so called in *Japan*, and also some part of our *Sunday* (though not the same part) is coincident with part of theirs in *America*. But very little of theirs in the East of *Japan*, with theirs in the West of *America*. About Eleven a clock at night in the one (or yet later) before it begins to be one a clock in the morning in the other, (scarce an hour in common) according to our ancient Maps. (Our later Maps make it somewhat more, as if it might be Ten at night in the one, when it begins to be Two in the morning at the other.) Yet these pass for the same *Sunday*. And 'tis well enough so to reckon.

But it is *Prudentially* so: Because the chief Trade and intercourse of *America*, is with *Europe*; not with *Asia*. And therefore it is considered as lying *West* from *Europe*; rather than as *East* from *Japan*. And accordingly it is so placed in our Maps. And though we continue to reckon our *Longitude* as from a Meridian between *Us* and *America*, yet the account of our days we begin as from a Meridian beyond it, between *America* and *Asia*.

Which

Part I. The CHRISTIAN SABBATH. 85

Which is not said to raise *new scruples*, (as if I would advise an alteration of a received computation; which is well enough as it is; and I know not how to mend it:) But to shew there is an unavoidable Necessity of leaving much to *Prudential* considerations, What day shall be reputed *Sunday*, and what the *Sabbath*, in this or that place. And therefore it cannot reasonably be thought the design of the *fourth Commandment* to confine us to such *Circumstantial* *Niceties*, which do not at all influence the *Substantials* of *Worship*.

The *fourth Commandment* requires the *seventh* day of *Holy Rest*, after *six* days of ordinary *Labour*. But of a *Seventh* day in course from the *Creation* to be so observed, it saith nothing: Nor is it possible for us to know. The *Jews* observed a *seventh* day in course from the *first raining of Manna*; but I do not know how this concerns us; or, if it did, how we shall know which is that day? (for this Gentleman will not allow *Tradition* to be a good proof.) We observe a *seventh* day in course from what (we think) the *Apostles* did observe. If we mistake our reckoning (which I think we do not) it is not a *Culpable* Ignorance; for it is according to the best Light we have. This day we are in possession of, and the Christian Church hath so been for many *Hundred* years. And he that would dispossess us of it, must shew a better Title. (The old rule is, *Possidentis potior est ratio*.) To change merely for change sake, is Foolish. If he would lay a *Divine Necessity* on us to observe the *Jewish Sabbath* from the first raining of *Manna* (if at least that be the day by them observed in our Saviour's time;) he must make it clear to us, which is that day (by a better argument, if he can, than *Tradition*;) And, that we are of necessity obliged to that day; which was (himself acknowledges) a *distinctive* sign of them from other Nations, as *Circumcision* also was. And if this *distinctive* mark (when the partition wall is broken down) do as much cease as that did: 'Tis as truly *superstition* now to put a necessity upon it, as upon *Circumcision*. Which though the *Apostles* would, for a while, permit to the *Jews*; (to whom it had once been a Law) till they should be better satisfied; Yet would by no means allow to the *Gentiles*, to whom it had not before been a Law. And I think the case is just the same of the *Jewish Sabbath* as contradicting to the *Lord's Day*.

I am

Yours, &c.

FINIS.

ADVERTISEMENT.

Theological Discourses (of the same Author) in Two Parts. The former containing Eight Letters and Three Sermons concerning the Trinity: The latter containing Sermons and other Treatises on divers Occasions. Are Printed for Thomas Parkhurst, at the Bible and Three Crowns in Cheapside near Mercers-Chappel.

DEFENSE
CHRISTIANITY

HEM ALDRICH

Vice-Chancellor

CHRISTIANITY

THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD